

Essays in Renaissance Thought and Letters

Brill's Studies in Intellectual History

General Editor

Han van Ruler (*Erasmus University Rotterdam*)

Founded by

Arjo Vanderjagt

Editorial Board

C.S. Celenza (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore*)

M. Colish (*Yale University*)

J.I. Israel (*Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton*)

A. Koba (*University of Tokyo*)

M. Mugnai (*Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa*)

W. Otten (*University of Chicago*)

VOLUME 241

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/bsih



Essays in Renaissance Thought and Letters

In Honor of John Monfasani

Edited by

Alison Frazier and Patrick Nold



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: Bessarion's *In calumniatorem Platonis* (Venice: Aldus Manutius, 1503), sign. 05r. Courtesy Harry Ransom Center, The University of Texas at Austin. Bessarion's *In calumniatorem Platonis*, an attack on George of Trebizond's interpretation of Plato, has been central to John Monfasani's scholarship. The image here comes from Book v, where Bessarion comments on the 'natural theology' presented in Plato's *Laws*, Bk. x.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Essays in Renaissance thought and letters : in honor of John Monfasani / edited by Alison Frazier and Patrick Nold.

pages cm. — (Brill's studies in intellectual history, ISSN 0920-8607 ; volume 241)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-29447-9 (hardback : acid-free paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-29465-3 (e-book) 1. Renaissance. 2. Intellectual life—History—To 1500. 3. Byzantine Empire—Intellectual life. 4. Philosophy, Renaissance. 5. Philosophy, Ancient. 6. Philosophy—Byzantine Empire. 7. Latin literature—History and criticism. 8. Byzantine literature—History and criticism. I. Frazier, Alison Knowles. II. Nold, Patrick. III. Monfasani, John.

CB361.E777 2015

940.2'1—dc23

2015009630

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual 'Brill' typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0920-8607

ISBN 978-90-04-29447-9 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-29465-3 (e-book)

Copyright 2015 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Contents

Contributors x

Introduction XIII

Patrick Nold and Alison Frazier

Publications by John Monfasani, 1969–2014 XLII

PART 1

Notes

- 1 Byzantines at Rome in the Fifteenth Century 3

Concetta Bianca

- 2 Badgering for Books

*Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini and Leonardo Bruni's Translation of
Aristotle's Politics* 12

Thomas Izbicki

- 3 Heralds of Antiquity

Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini and the British "Thucydides" 23

David Rundle

- 4 Petrus Crinitus and Ancient Latin Poetry 36

Christopher S. Celenza

- 5 Erasmus's Use of George Trapezuntius of Crete in *De conscribendis
epistolis* 53

Peter Mack

PART 2

Essays

- 6 The Byzantine Social Elite and the Market Economy, Eleventh to
Mid-Fifteenth Century 67

David Jacoby

- 7 **George of Trebizond, Renaissance Libertarian?** 87
 James Hankins
- 8 **The School of San Lorenzo, Niccolò Machiavelli, Paolo Sassi, and
 Benedetto Riccardini** 107
 Robert Black
- 9 **Renaissance Sources in Medieval Mirrors for Princes**
Petrarch and Andreas Pannonius 134
 Sándor Bene
- 10 **Marsilio Ficino as a Reader of Proclus and Most Notably of Proclus’
*In Parmenidem*** 179
 Michael J. B. Allen
- 11 **De-essentializing the World**
Valla, Agricola, Vives, and Nizolio on Universals and Topics 196
 Lodi Nauta
- 12 **The Quest for Certainty in Fact and Faith**
Pierre-Daniel Huet and Josephus’ Testimonium Flavianum 216
 April G. Shelford

PART 3

Extended Discussions and Editions

- 13 **Christian Scepticism**
*The Reception of Xenophanes’ B34 in Heathen and Christian Antiquity
 and its Sequel in Byzantine Thought* 243
 John A. Demetracopoulos
- 14 **Lactantius Philosophus?**
*Reading, Misreading, and Exploiting Lactantius from Antiquity to the
 Early Renaissance* 446
 David Rutherford

- 15 **Andreas Chrysoberges' *Dialogue* against Mark Eugenikos** 492
 Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel
- 16 **Notes from a Nominalist in a New Incunabulum by Symphorien
 Champier** 546
 Brian Copenhaver and Thomas M. Ward
- Index of Manuscripts** 605
 Index of Modern Authors 607
 Index of Pre-modern Authors and Persons 625

Contributors

Michael J.B. Allen

is Distinguished Professor Emeritus of English at UCLA, and an authority on Renaissance Platonism. He recently edited and translated Marsilio Ficino's commentary on two treatises attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, *On Mystical Theology*, and *On the Divine Names*.

Sándor Bene

is senior research fellow at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Budapest, Hungary) and associate professor of Hungarian Studies at the University of Zagreb (Croatia). He is co-editor of *The Old and the New: Parallels and Contacts in Croatian and Hungarian Renaissance* (forthcoming).

Concetta Bianca

is full professor of Mediaeval and Humanistic Philology at the University of Florence, and has published widely on Coluccio Salutati, Bessarion, Roman Humanism, and the history of libraries and printing. She directs the journal *Medioevo e Rinascimento*.

Robert Black

is Emeritus Professor of Renaissance History at the University of Leeds. His most recent book, *Machiavelli* (2013), was a *Times Literary Supplement* book of the year in 2013; an Italian translation (Viella, Rome) will be published in 2016.

Christopher S. Celenza

formerly director of the American Academy in Rome (2010–2014), is now Chairman of the Classics Department at Johns Hopkins University. His most recent book is *Machiavelli: A Portrait* (2015).

Brian Copenhaver

is Distinguished Professor of Philosophy and History and holds the Udvar-Hazy Chair at UCLA. His recent writing is about medieval logic, magic in Western culture and philosophy in the sixteenth century.

John A. Demetracopoulos

is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Theology at the University of Patras, Greece. Several of his publications over the last decade regard the reception of the thought of Thomas Aquinas in Late Byzantium.

Alison Frazier

is Associate Professor of History at the University of Texas at Austin. Following *Possible Lives: Authors and Saints in Renaissance Italy* (2005), her publications include *The Saint Between Manuscript and Print: Italy 1400–1600* (2015).

James Hankins

is Professor of History at Harvard University and the General Editor of the I Tatti Renaissance Library. He is finishing a book on *The Virtue Politics of the Italian Humanists*.

Martin Hinterberger

is Associate Professor of Byzantine Philology at the University of Cyprus. His research focuses on emotions in Byzantine literature, the language of Byzantine literature (learned and vernacular), (auto)biography and hagiography as well as on intellectual history.

Thomas Izbicki

is Interim Associate University Librarian for Collection Development, Rutgers University Libraries, and received his doctorate in Medieval History from Cornell University (1973) and a library degree from Indiana University (1986). His publications focus on Pope Pius II, Nicholas of Cusa and Juan de Torquemada.

David Jacoby

is Professor Emeritus of Medieval History at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. His research focuses on intercultural exchanges and maritime trade between the West, Byzantium, the Crusader states and Egypt in the 11th–15th centuries. His current projects include *Crusader Acre* and *Silk and Silk Textiles in Byzantium and the Medieval Mediterranean*.

Peter Mack

is Professor of English at the University of Warwick, and has been editor of *Rhetorica* and Director of the Warburg Institute, University of London. His most recent book is *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620* (2011).

Lodi Nauta

is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Groningen, and Dean of its Faculty of Philosophy. His most recent book is *In Defense of Common Sense: Lorenzo Valla's Humanist Critique of Scholastic Philosophy* (2009).

Patrick Nold

is Associate Professor of History at the University at Albany, SUNY. His most recent book is *Marriage Advice for a Pope: John XXII and the Power to Dissolve* (2008).

David Rundle

is Lecturer in History and Co-Director of the Centre for Bibliographical History at the University of Essex. He edited *Humanism in Fifteenth-Century Europe* (2012) and is completing a monograph entitled *The English Quattrocento*.

David Rutherford

is Professor Emeritus of Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, MI. He is the author of *Early Renaissance Invective and the Controversies of Antonio da Rho* (2005).

Chris Schabel

is Professor of Medieval History at the University of Cyprus, specializing in intellectual history and the Latin East. His recent publications include (with Charles Perrat and Jean Richard) *Bullarium Cyprium*, 3 vols. (2010–12) and (with William Duba) *Bullarium Hellenicum* (2015).

April G. Shelford

is Associate Professor of History at American University, Washington, DC. She published *Transforming the Republic of Letters: Pierre-Daniel Huet and European Intellectual Life, 1650–1720* with the University of Rochester Press in 2007.

Thomas M. Ward

is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Loyola Marymount University. He is the author of *John Duns Scotus on Parts, Wholes, and Hylomorphism* (Brill, 2014).

Introduction

Patrick Nold and Alison Frazier

John Monfasani was born, with his twin sister Mary, on 5 July 1943 in the Misericordia Hospital of Manhattan. His mother, Clementina Trapassi, was also born in New York City but, after her father's abandonment, she was taken back to Italy when she was three. She grew up with her mother's family, the Feroldi, in Bedonia in the province of Parma, returning to the USA in 1932 at the age of 18. His father, Alessandro, came from Ceci, a village in the hills above Bobbio in the province of Piacenza. Family legend has it that the name Monfasani came from a Napoleonic soldier who had deserted, eventually settling in the Northern Apennines. John enjoyed speculating that the original French name might have been "Malfaisant," and that some people would consider this appropriate in his case. John, however, personally preferred the alternative, and perhaps more apt, etymology of Monfasani as a corruption of "Montfaucon," the name of the great Benedictine and Greek manuscript scholar.¹ But, in any case, the name Monfasani is extremely rare and until the 1930s was only to be found in the village of Ceci itself. Alessandro emigrated in the late 1920s to NYC where he worked as a waiter. Alessandro and Clementina met in New York City. The Northern Apennine immigrant community in NYC was relatively small (especially compared to the Southern Italian community), so it is not surprising that they encountered each other.

From John Monfasani's birth until his marriage in 1968, he lived at 180 East 104th Street in Manhattan, between Third and Lexington Avenues. This was East Harlem, once the predominantly Italian neighborhood evoked in Robert Orsi's *The Madonna of 115th Street*.² But in Monfasani's youth it was already referred to as "Spanish Harlem" or "El Barrio" because of the Puerto Rican immigration waves in the early 1930s and after World War II. Though the area was a slum, his block was relatively safe due to the presence of the 23rd police precinct directly across the street from Monfasani's building where his maternal great-uncle was the superintendent. Monfasani's first language was the dialect of the northern Apennines and he kept an ear for Italian all his life. With

¹ An admiration that began when John read, as a young man, David Knowles, *Great Historical Enterprises: Problems in Monastic History* (London: Thomas Nelson, 1963).

² Robert A. Orsi, *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880–1950* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985). I thank my UAlbany colleague Nadia Kizenko for pointing out to me that this book was about John Monfasani's neighborhood as a child.

his sister, Mary, John attended kindergarten at the local public school (PS 72 – now a historic landmark housing the Julia de Burgos Latino Cultural Center), where they spent two years rectifying their broken English. English was the language of the streets in John's multi-ethnic neighborhood: he picked it up from the neighborhood kids with whom he played games like stoopball. His first grade teacher at PS 72, Mrs. Roberts, identified John (and his sister) as smart (despite having “failed” kindergarten), and told his mother to put them in a parochial school. So, starting in second grade, he attended St. Lucy's School, between First and Second Avenues on 104th Street. The first day at the new school was a shock for the Monfasani twins: they returned home in tears, telling their mother in despair, “They can read!” In a class of 50 students, the second grade teacher did not have time to help the two new students to catch up. So the Monfasani twins learned to read on their own, and in the end became speed readers in their own peculiar way – Monfasani was in high school before he understood what a syllable was.

By the seventh grade, John had grown in wisdom and stature. His teacher, Sr. Mary Geraldine, asked if he would be interested in going to minor seminary. John was attracted to the idea of a better education, and was open to the possibility of a vocation. So in September 1957 he entered Cathedral College, the minor seminary of the Archdiocese of New York (555 West End Avenue, at the corner of 87th Street) for a six-year period of study. At Cathedral, he was a contemporary to several students who would later distinguish themselves in academe. In the classes above Monfasani were: John P. Meier, whom Monfasani deemed ‘the cervello’ of the school, and who would later write a renowned series of books on the historical Jesus,³ as well as David Tracy⁴ and Joseph Komonchak,⁵ who would later become prominent ‘liberal’ Catholic theologians; in class below Monfasani was Thomas Turley, a future scholar of the reign of the all-important Pope John XXII (1316–1334).⁶ With Turley, Monfasani played on Cathedral's basketball team and he had a knack for the jump shot.

3 Professor of Theology at the University of Notre Dame. See John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, 4 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991–2009).

4 Professor of Theology at the University of Chicago Divinity school and author of ten books including *The Achievement of Bernard Lonergan* (New York: Herder, 1970) and (with Hans Küng and Johann Baptist Metz), *Towards Vatican III: The Work that Needs to be Done* (New York: Seabury Press, 1978).

5 Professor of Theology at The Catholic University of America and English editor of Giuseppe Alberigo's controversial *The History of Vatican II*, 5 vols. (Maryknoll: Orbis books, 1996–2006)

6 Thomas Turley, “Infallibilists in the Curia of Pope John XXII,” *Journal of Medieval History* 1 (1975): 71–101 and “John XXII and the Franciscans: A Reappraisal,” in *Popes, Teachers and Canon Law in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of Brian Tierney*, ed. James R. Sweeney and Stanley Chodorow (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), 74–88.

But, most importantly, at Cathedral he learned Latin, which he took to like a duck to water. He still enjoys reciting, in his New York City accent, the Latin inscription over the stove at a one of the seminary retreat houses: “He secretly knows the Faith” (“Feed’em Clam Shit”). He learned Greek in the seminary as well, but not to the extent of Latin: it was not offered until the fifth year of study, by which time he had already begun to think about leaving the seminary, and he did not get on with his Greek teacher. But Monfasani was liked by all the other teachers and administrators at Cathedral College, so as a parting gift, they arranged for him to take a battery of tests conducted by a special evaluation firm in lower Manhattan to see if he was fitted for more practical, remunerative lines of work, rather than the social work and liberal arts paths of most ex-seminarians. The man who conducted the test came up to him at the end, put his hand on his shoulder, and said: “Son, in twenty years of running these tests, I’ve never seen anyone score as low as you did. Go to college.” In September 1963, Monfasani transferred to Fordham University in the Bronx, having taken summer courses at Hunter College and Fordham’s Manhattan campus beforehand.

Already before he left minor seminary, Monfasani had come to the realization that he wanted to be a historian. He liked the history teacher at Cathedral College, Monsignor Florence Cohalan, resident historian of the Archdiocese of New York.⁷ Cohalan, a charismatic teacher, was a friend of William F. Buckley Jr., who often dropped by the College. Monfasani went to Fordham with the intention of becoming a medieval historian, and he always maintained a profound appreciation for the period throughout his career, as evidenced in publications like “The Renaissance as the Concluding Phase of the Middle Ages” (2006) and *Bessarion Scholasticus* (2012). But, on the whole, Fordham proved an unsatisfying intellectual experience. He felt no strong affinity for the institutional history approach of the person who taught him the medieval period, the Hispanist Joseph O’Callaghan, and he was not impressed by the theologians there, especially the Jesuits (whom he deemed a largely trendy and unserious lot in the mid-1960s). His fellow students seemed to him mostly uninterested in learning. But the experience was, nonetheless, determinative. Fordham introduced him to philosophy and to the Italian Renaissance. He especially liked John C. Olin (unrelated to the academic philanthropist John M. Olin), a scholar of Erasmus who taught the Renaissance and Reformation courses.⁸ And so Monfasani gravitated away from the Middle Ages and towards the Renaissance and Reformation.

7 *A Popular History of the Archdiocese of New York* (New York: Catholic Historical Society, 1983).

8 *As I Remember Fordham: Selections from the Sesquicentennial Oral History Project* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1991), 152–4.

After graduating from Fordham, Monfasani was offered an assistantship at Washington University in St. Louis. But he chose to go, unfunded, to Columbia (where Olin himself had done his Ph.D), because it would have been a hardship for his parents if he had left NYC. Monfasani thought he had saved enough money working at a local supermarket for a year, but after his first semester at Columbia his savings had evaporated and he was forced to take out a loan. Still, he felt it was worth it: he loved Columbia from the start – here, in contrast to Fordham, students and teachers seemed genuinely committed to their subjects.

His first interview at Columbia was with the Renaissance historian, Eugene Rice. After learning that Monfasani had six years of Latin and two years of Greek, Rice told him to take Paul Oskar Kristeller's seminar. Monfasani had vaguely recalled Olin mentioning Kristeller, but otherwise knew nothing about him. At the first meeting of the seminar the next night, he wondered whether Rice had advised him well. Kristeller sat slumped in his chair, speaking in a weak voice, and Monfasani was clearly the youngest person in the room. Kristeller had high standards and would later solemnly tell his students at the end of term: "Henceforth I shall help you in direct proportion to as you will help scholarship." Before the next class meeting, Monfasani bought a copy of Kristeller's *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic and Humanist Strains* (1961). He read it and fell in love. This was the sort of work he wanted to do: intellectual history. The assignment for the term was a bio-bibliographical paper on an understudied figure of the Renaissance. Monfasani was stumped and went to Rice, who after a moment's thought, said "George of Trebizond." Monfasani turned in his paper in December; Kristeller called him in January, saying, "If I had to grade you on the basis of my corrections, you would fail; but if you correct the errors as I suggest, I will see to it that the paper is published."

Rice himself had not been initially impressed by Monfasani and probably would have recommended a terminal MA after the first semester had he not talked to Kristeller. But after Monfasani won Kristeller's approval, Rice was prepared to give Monfasani a second look and came to agree with Kristeller that John had scholarly *nous*. In his second semester, Monfasani wrote his MA thesis for Rice on George of Trebizond based on the work he had begun for Kristeller. The next fall he became Rice's research assistant and was then given a two-year doctoral fellowship. Monfasani became enormously devoted to his two teachers – later acknowledging that he owed his career to Rice and his scholarship to Kristeller – eventually editing *Festschriften* for both.

When his Columbia fellowship ran out in his fourth year, Monfasani taught Western Civilization at Rutgers University in Newark to make ends meet. By this time he was married and living in Westbury, Long Island, with his wife Adrianne (née Fazio – whose grandparents came from Sicily) whom he had

met through his sister, then studying at Hunter College. They had married in 1968.

Monfasani would have had great difficulty completing the dissertation while teaching full time. So it was his great fortune to win a two-year fellowship at the American Academy in Rome for the years 1969–71. Rome would be an enormously fruitful place for him, and not just because he had two children there, Alex in December 1969 and Cristina in January 1971. He also took the opportunity to do a degree at the *Scuola Vaticana di Paleografia, Diplomatica e Archivistica* – only the second American to have done so after Virginia Brown, who had finished her degree and her fellowship at the AAR just as Monfasani arrived in 1969. Monfasani had already started working on manuscripts in his first year at Columbia, compiling a census of the surviving copies of George of Trebizond's works. He also began editing texts: Kristeller had used a research fund from the National Endowment for the Humanities to purchase a microfilm from the Marciana Library in Venice. The *Scuola* widened Monfasani's palaeographical competence tremendously, extending it back to the medieval period, but demanded relatively little time investment (3 hours per week for 2 years). The rest of the time he spent working on his dissertation on George of Trebizond, completing chapters on his rhetoric and logic, narrating the biography, and assembling an appendix of edited texts.

Near the end of the AAR fellowship, he had an intellectual epiphany in the Vatican Library while reading the Apocalypse of the Pseudo-Methodius.⁹ He realized that George was actually an apocalyptic prophet and that everyone had got him wrong – and if they got him wrong in general, maybe they got the specifics wrong too (like the dating of his works). Following this moment of clarity, John embarked on what he would call his “second dissertation,” begun in Rome, but almost entirely written in the early hours of the morning during his first year of teaching. At his dissertation defense in the fall of 1972, the chair of the classics department, Walther Ludwig, whom Monfasani had never met before, immediately came up to him and asked if he would be willing to have his dissertation be the first volume in a new series on the classical tradition. The next year during a fellowship at Villa I Tatti (1973–74), he turned his dissertation into a proper book, which came out in 1976 and won the John Nicholas Brown prize of the Medieval Academy of America in 1980.

Monfasani left for Rome in 1969 thinking that his future in American academe was secure. Jobs were plentiful and so it would be relatively easy to find a permanent position. He returned to discover that the golden sixties were over and the leaden seventies had begun. In 1971, Eugene Rice was asked by Michael

9 Recently translated by Benjamin Garstad, *Apocalypse. An Alexandrian World Chronicle* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

Cherniavsky, Professor of Russian History at UAlbany (State University of New York), who was at the time also a visiting professor at Columbia teaching a graduate seminar, if he had anyone to recommend for a job in Renaissance History. Rice immediately recommended Monfasani and he received a job offer while he was still in Rome at the American Academy. Three weeks after Monfasani had moved with his young family to Albany, a hiring freeze was declared at SUNY and he was told that he would be let go at the end of the academic year. But in the spring of 1972, Cherniavsky himself was offered a position at Carnegie Mellon University. The move was not a fortunate one for Cherniavsky as he would die in Pittsburgh the following year. But it was fortunate for Monfasani: his line was saved, though he continued to work on one-year contracts for the next nine years due to the budget crises. Retrenchment came to a head in 1975–6 when some humanities programs were deactivated at UAlbany (an exercise repeated during a similar budget crisis in 2010–11).¹⁰

The University at Albany, with its Islamic-inspired poured-concrete campus designed by the modernist architect Edward Durrell Stone, was part of New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller's ambitious attempt to establish a public university system on par with that of other states like California.¹¹ A teachers' training college had existed in Albany since 1844 but in 1957 it was transformed into a doctoral degree-granting University to become one of four research centers in the SUNY system (the others were Buffalo, Binghamton, and Stony Brook). The stumbling block to this conversion was the existing tenured professoriate.

Hired to work at a middle-rank teachers college, many faculty members had not done any significant scholarly research since they had written their doctoral dissertations. Although the advent of Ph.D programs should have led to the recruitment of faculty members doing cutting-edge work, and therefore capable of supervising scholarly research by their students, many of the carry-overs from the teachers college –

10 For the first crisis, there are two somewhat self-congratulatory accounts written from an internal perspective by administrators: Robert C. Shirley, "The SUNY-Albany experience," in *Responses to Fiscal Stress in Higher Education*, ed. Robert C. Shirley (Tuscon: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1982); J. Fredericks Volkwein, "Responding to Financial Retrenchment: Lessons for the Albany experience," *Journal of Higher Education* 55 (1984): 389–401. For the second crisis, external and critical accounts predominate. See, for example, Stanley Fish, "The Crisis of the Humanities Officially Arrives," *New York Times*, October 11, 2010.

11 Kendall A. Birt, *A Tradition of Excellence: the Sesquicentennial History of the University at Albany, the State University of New York* (Virginia Beach: Donning, 1994).

particularly in the History department – were rather lackadaisical about this. Instead they often hired people much like themselves: competent in the classroom but weak in scholarly credentials.¹²

Monfasani ran into this problem early on. He was once not recommended for his yearly job renewal by the chair of the department, Joseph Zacek, on the grounds that “Monfasani belongs at Harvard, not at UAlbany.” Throughout his career, Monfasani campaigned against a “mindset of mediocrity,” as he described it, which, he felt, prevented UAlbany from achieving its potential as a research institution. He always held both colleagues and students to exceptionally high standards – something not always appreciated by either group. He twice offered his services to the department as chair, but colleagues declined both times.

Only in 1980, the year his third child, Mark, was born, did Monfasani’s scholarly career become secure with the reception of tenure. The same year, he received the Medieval Academy Prize for best first book and a Guggenheim Fellowship (1980–81). The Guggenheim, along with a second I Tatti fellowship (1982–83), allowed Monfasani to complete his second book, *Collectanea Trapezuntiana* (1984). Over fifteen years of working on George of Trebizond had resulted in two books, but it soon became clear that there were more dividends to be paid out in the form of miscellaneous articles: from the mid-1980s onward these began to come thick and fast. Once the *magnum opus* had been published, Monfasani was free to do other things – and, having learned so much in the process of writing that *magnum opus*, he could now do many things. The ensuing avalanche of articles may have also had something to do with the need to support a family: the discretionary raise system at UAlbany was such that it was far more remunerative to write articles than books.

The next big career change occurred in 1995, when John became Executive Director of the Renaissance Society of America (RSA), a position once held by Monfasani’s Doktorvater Rice (1966–1982 and 1985–87). Monfasani had been on the RSA’s Executive Board since 1989 but only took the job as a last minute replacement. In his fifteen years as director, the RSA nearly doubled in size (from about 2300 to about 4200 members) and became more international – partly due to Monfasani’s daring idea (which was thought crazy at the time) of holding RSA meetings abroad every five years, beginning with Florence in the year 2000. More than 2500 registrants attended his farewell meeting in Venice

12 This is the judgment of Lawrence Wittner, *Working for Peace and Justice: Memoirs of an Activist Intellectual* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2012), 128. Wittner came to UAlbany in 1974.

2010, compared to the 230 to 400 registrants at meetings when his directorship began. Monfasani's stewardship of the RSA is all the more remarkable in that he did it part time without any slowing down of his scholarly output, and while teaching a full 2/2 course load at UAlbany.

Monfasani's relationship with UAlbany was conditioned by his initial employment on one-year contracts. So, though he dutifully served in a full range of faculty governance positions over the years, Monfasani largely made his career outside the university. He was often away for the academic year on fellowship. When not, he would typically make several research trips to Europe a year to read manuscripts – religiously going directly to the library after a transatlantic night flight so as not to waste precious research time. Like Theodor Mommsen who combined the *Liber Pater* with the *Liber Pontificalis*, Monfasani could, through the fog of jet lag, transcribe Greek and Latin with a high degree of accuracy. He knew the 'cheapo' places to stay near most major European libraries – some of these *pensiones* were run by nuns, others most definitely were not. He knew where to eat well but inexpensively: his favorite place was, of course, that social hub for manuscript scholars, the Vatican library bar (founded by Leonard Boyle O.P.). His regular European trips – and his proficient Italian – allowed him to develop and maintain a network of academic *amici* who often hosted him. When in the United States, Monfasani worked in his basement study (containing the essentials of a microfilm reader, a wood stove, and his reference books) in Loudonville, NY, rather than in his university office. He made monthly Saturday trips to Columbia (by train) or Harvard (by car) to look up references that were unobtainable in the modestly endowed UAlbany library. Still, Monfasani did not make moving elsewhere a priority: so he remained first in a small village in Gaul rather than second in command in Rome.

The composition of the UAlbany History Department and the University's progressive abolition of supporting humanities programs made it difficult for Monfasani to train Ph.D. students. So he preferred to send his best students elsewhere – several of them are contributors to this volume. His primary consideration, like Kristeller's, was always to help students make the maximal contribution to scholarship. For most of his career, no one in the UAlbany History Department – comprised mostly of Americanists – really understood what Monfasani's research was about; only quite recently did he manage to bring in scholars whose interests were close to his own, such as the medievalist Patrick Nold (2006) and the Byzantinist Dimitri Korobeinikov (2012).¹³ He did,

13 Patrick Nold, *Pope John XXII and his Franciscan Cardinal: Bertrand de la Tour and the Apostolic Poverty Controversy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Dimitri Korobeinikov, *Byzantium and the Turks in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

however, enjoy a long friendship with the Korean-American historian of Dutch New York, Sung Bok Kim, who arrived shortly after Monfasani and who shared Monfasani's educational and political ideas.¹⁴ Nominated by Kim (and Nold) for a Distinguished Professorship in 2007, Monfasani was finally awarded the title in 2011.

The delay may have had something to do with the waves Monfasani made in the early years of the third millennium.¹⁵ On February 10, 2002, Monfasani wrote a memorandum to the entire UAlbany community revealing that the chair of the Classics Department, Louis Roberts, had committed substantial plagiarism in a book published by UAlbany and its Institute for Cypriot Studies.¹⁶ The plagiarism had been discovered by Chris Schabel while working on a book on Latin Cyprus.¹⁷ Though reported to University administrators in 2000, no action had been taken at the time of Monfasani's email. The 2002 memorandum was intended as a goad: "I did not ask to blow the whistle on Louis Roberts at UAlbany, but no one else seems ready to do so." The national press got wind of the story¹⁸ and eventually action was taken. The Classics Department never quite recovered from the scandal and the major was abolished in 2010 during the budget crisis. Monfasani was not fêted by administrators on account of his provocation, but eventually (after a changing of the guard) he was honored by the University, not only with the bestowal of a distinguished professorship in 2011, but also in being named Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in 2012.

• • •

"It would be hard to find an area of late medieval and early modern thought, from the Greek East to the Latin West, that John Monfasani has not visited and improved," observe two distinguished contributors to this volume.¹⁹ The

14 See Sung Bok Kim, *Landlord and Tenant in Colonial New York: Manorial Society 1664–1775* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1978).

15 This period of the history of UAlbany is idiosyncratically chronicled by Hermann P. Salomon, *Greed and Corruption: the Downfall of Humanities at SUNY Albany, 1995–2003* (Braga: Edições APPACDM, 2003).

16 *Sources for the History of Cyprus*, vol. VIII, *Latin Texts from the First Century BC to the Seventeenth Century AD* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2000).

17 *The Synodicum Nicosiense and Other Documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus, 1196–1373* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Center, 2001).

18 See Karen W. Arenson, "SUNY Classics Professor is Accused of Plagiarism," *The New York Times*, Feb. 22, 2002; also *Chronicle of Higher Education* Feb. 21, 2002.

19 Brian Copenhaver and Thomas Ward, at 551 below.

catalogue of Monfasani's opera, which follows below, bears out the observation. Its length attests to intellectual energy; its focused entries, to perspicuous intelligence. The catalogue's particular aim and breadth, however, point to Monfasani's historiographical moment, which included the presence of Paul Oskar Kristeller and Eugene F. Rice at Columbia University and thus, as Patrick has intimated above, some fortuitous guidance in the choice of dissertation topic.²⁰

To understand the enigmatic George of Trebizond, Monfasani had to command George's span of interests, which themselves had not been fully appreciated. The first fruit of this study was *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic* (1976). In a 'masterful analysis' based on "penetrating knowledge of both the Italian Renaissance and the culture of Byzantium,"²¹ Monfasani established the little-known George of Trebizond as a "major intellectual figure . . . of the fifteenth century,"²² a man whose contributions to rhetoric and logic, as well as to theologico-political thought, Greek-to-Latin translation, Patristics, and the Plato-Aristotle controversy would shape humanism both north and south. Thanks to a sudden insight, Monfasani grasped the 'key' to George's intellectual eccentricities: his prophetic apprehension – as the Ottoman Empire expanded with an eye first on Byzantium and then on Rome – that impious Platonism would lead to apocalypse, the fall of the West.²³ "[M]uch more will have to be written before we have a full picture of George of Trebizond,"²⁴ Monfasani noted, but that first book has remained, alongside its companion anthology of documents, the *Collectanea Trapezuntiana* (1984), the point of departure for serious work on George and his cultural context.

Reviewers of *George of Trebizond* recognized that Monfasani brought other gifts than breadth to the narrative. In method, Monfasani favors Kristeller's precise attention to details of biography, institution, network, and locale in the study of textual production and circulation; articles that work out dating, identify texts, and profile little-known humanists are specialties attesting

20 Above, at xvi.

21 First quotation from Ronald G. Witt in *Speculum* 53, 2 (1978), at 408; second from Deno J. Geanakoplos, review of *George of Trebizond* (1976) in *Renaissance Quarterly* 32, 3 (1979), at 356.

22 Witt, review (as preceding note), at 406.

23 See *George of Trebizond*, ix, for the "key" metaphor. On the moment of Monfasani's "epiphany" see above xvii.

24 *George of Trebizond*, ix. In this volume, James Hankins explores George's political stance still further.

to Monfasani's building-block approach to the convincing argument.²⁵ Combined with his formal training in paleography and codicology (something that Kristeller did not possess), this method renders Monfasani a traditional, not to say a defiantly "old Europe" intellectual historian.²⁶ All is married to a distinctive style – "sempre puntuale e lucido nel suo ordine espositivo"²⁷ – that reflects on one hand a jeweler's care for the factual minutiae in themselves, and on the other a rigorous view to the whole that drives the assembly of small parts into field-changing, often polemically energetic analyses. For all his expertise in Renaissance rhetoric, Monfasani's own prose style is, like that of Thomas Aquinas, "always a penny plain rather than a twopence colored":²⁸ one might say that for Monfasani, beauty and truth are the same thing, and what matters is the apprehension of it, not its description. In the end, his is indeed a "crisp method" that produces reliable results.²⁹

Monfasani's special grace has been to reveal the importance of unpublished and understudied documents – often by identifying scribes, annotators, or early stages of texts.³⁰ Rare is the Monfasani publication that lacks an appendix of critical editions; rare, the review of any of his works that does not admire that documentary base. All these positive aspects – scholarly breadth, methodological precision, lucid argument, punctilious research, deep documentary evidence and, it must be added, an intriguing mixture of aversion to Theory coupled with a willingness to propose comprehensive interim hypotheses – have characterized Monfasani's publications ever since.³¹

25 On Kristeller's methodologies, see essays in *Kristeller Reconsidered* (2006), including Monfasani, "Kristeller and Manuscripts."

26 In a sense, to call that scholarly style traditional is to miss the novelty of the field: see Monfasani, "Kristeller and Manuscripts," noting the remark of a leading scholar that "Kristeller was the only man he knew who had created a whole field of scholarship without even thinking about it" (193).

27 Review by Alfonso de Petris in *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 42, 2 (1978), at 378.

28 Gilbert Keith Chesterton, *St. Thomas Aquinas* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1933), 98.

29 Quotation from Francesco Giannachi's review of *Bessarion Scholasticus* in *Renaissance Quarterly* 65, 4 (2012), at 1177.

30 Identifying scribes: e.g., in "Testi inediti di Bessarione e Teodoro Gaza" (1992), at 240 (George Hermonimous). On Monfasani's reconstruction of the compositional stages of Bessarion's *In calumniatorem Platonis* (ICP), see below.

31 Monfasani's aversion to Theory played to a relatively large academic audience thanks to "Was Lorenzo Valla an Ordinary Language Philosopher?" (1988), disputing the relevance of Wittgenstein to Valla. For an instance of the application of an interim hypothesis, see "Aristotelians, Platonists, and the Missing Ockhamists" (1993).

So far, those publications amount to over six dozen articles, many now collected into three Variorum volumes (with two more in the works); four small books with extensive appendices; two co-edited Festschriften; several obituaries and a memorial collection for Paul Oskar Kristeller; as well as dozens of prefaces, editorials, and reviews. Monfasani's preferred territory is philosophy, religion, and rhetoric – the traditional foundation of Renaissance intellectual history – and the brief appreciation that follows here is roughly structured by those three fields. Other areas, of course, have also benefited from Monfasani's gifts: witness his solid contributions to fields such as paleography, art history, and book history.³² But a comprehensive view of Monfasani's output as preparation for the promised monograph on the Plato-Aristotle controversy would not be misleading: the larger part of his oeuvre treats precisely the rhetoricians, philosophers, and theologians of the émigré community that inaugurated the Plato-Aristotle controversy in its western and Renaissance form.³³

Rhetoric: Renaissance Reception of the Greek and Latin Traditions

Monfasani's most significant contributions rest on his mastery of both the Latin and Byzantine traditions. Perhaps in the field of rhetoric this advantage shone earliest and most clearly: Monfasani was the first to grasp that émigré George of Trebizond's *Rhetoricorum libri v* – “the only large scale secular *Rhetoric* produced by an Italian humanist in the fifteenth century”³⁴ – was so influential precisely because George understood how to combine the quite different Greek and Latin rhetorical traditions for a Western audience. This *aperçu* was not minor: the relation of the Byzantine rhetorical tradition to the

32 These include the paleographical study “Bernardo Giustiniani and Alfonso de Palencia” (1989); the art historical contribution “A Description of the Sistine Chapel” (1983); works relevant to book history, such as the prize-winning “The First Call for Press Censorship” (1988); contributions to histories of the religious orders (or we might say to the history of mendicancy), such as “The Fraticelli and Clerical Wealth in Quattrocento Rome” (1991); studies of the Catholic tradition, such as “Catholic American Exchange” (2008); encyclopedic treatments, e.g., of Renaissance “Science and Religion” (2002) and, co-edited with Brian Copenhaver, “Humanism” (1998); and a polemical work on periodization, “The Renaissance as Concluding Phase of the Middle Ages” (2006). The last-mentioned anchors Sándor Bene's contribution in this volume. For Monfasani's writings about Paul Oskar Kristeller, see below, xxxiv.

33 *George of Trebizond*, 228–9. See further below.

34 *George of Trebizond*, 262. Cf. Peter Mack's piece in this volume.

Renaissance was “almost virgin land.”³⁵ Mapping that territory – locating the émigrés, deciphering their intellectual commitments, pinpointing their influences – would contribute to the still untold “Hellenization of the West.”³⁶

The cartographic metaphor soon yielded to another more pointed, as Monfasani explored “the real disequilibrium between supply and demand on the intellectual market.”³⁷ Emigrés with deep rhetorical and philosophical expertise found themselves seeking positions in universities dominated by scholastic logic and in humanist classrooms dominated by Latin grammar and elementary Greek. Rhetorician George of Trebizond complained of having to support himself by teaching grammar to beginners, *infantie studia*.³⁸ George’s contemporary Theodore Gaza was a teacher’s assistant and Greek language instructor (he wrote a highly successful grammar) before he figured out how to make a living as professor of Greek literature; he finally achieved sufficient reputation to be called to Rome as curial copyist and translator of scientific works, and thence to the court of Alfonso the Magnanimous at Naples, where he translated military and homiletic texts.³⁹ Not all cared to accommodate themselves to that intellectual marketplace or managed to do so successfully.⁴⁰ Nonetheless, the Byzantines’ long and sophisticated rhetorical tradition meant that they appreciated the priorities of Italian humanists, even as the émigrés struggled to adapt to professional conditions on the peninsula.⁴¹

In his first book, Monfasani clarified not just George of Trebizond’s biography, but also the contributions of his *Rhetoric*, which George intended to “replace the classical manuals” including Quintilian’s *Institutio*, to embarrass medieval commentaries on Ciceronian rhetoric, and to challenge contemporary

35 “The Byzantine Rhetorical Tradition and the Renaissance” (1983), 174; the article draws on the major conclusions of Chapter 9 in *George of Trebizond*.

36 “The Byzantine Rhetorical Tradition and the Renaissance,” 187. For a more general analysis of the migration phenomenon, see “Greek Renaissance Migrations” (2002).

37 “L’Insegnamento universitario e la cultura bizantina” (1991), quoting from 45–6 (“un vero squilibrio fra offerta e domanda sul mercato intellettuale”); Monfasani emphasizes that the problem was not salary or lack of demand. See the contribution of Concetta Bianca in this volume.

38 *George of Trebizond*, 284 n. 165.

39 “L’Insegnamento di Teodoro Gaza a Ferrara” (1994); “Byzantine Rhetorical Tradition,” 180; “L’Insegnamento universitario e la cultura bizantina in Italia nel Quattrocento” (1990 = 1991), at 45; “Theodore Gaza as a Philosopher” (2002), 272. Gaza’s natural philosophical stance is underlined in the iconographic study, “Aristotle as the Scribe of Nature” (2006).

40 “L’Insegnamento universitario e la cultura bizantina in Italia nel Quattrocento,” 45–46 for some examples of unhappiness; cf. 52–53 for momentary market equilibrium in the 1460s.

41 *George of Trebizond*, 255.

teachers such as Guarino, Loschi, and Barzizza,⁴² George not only drew from Hermogenes and the much less appreciated Dionysius of Halicarnassus, but also framed for westerners the concepts basic to Byzantine rhetoric from the eighth century until George's own day.⁴³ His position was complex: on one hand, George held to the scholastic view of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as a basic "textbook in ethics and psychology," but on the other hand he had little use for that textbook himself.⁴⁴ In coming to terms with Latin rhetoric, George was similarly strong-willed. He promoted Cicero's mature, practical, and political orations over his adolescent treatises and handbooks;⁴⁵ and against Valla's youthful lionization of Quintilian as a teacher of rhetoric, George attacked the *Institutiones* as hopelessly muddled.⁴⁶

Not all rhetorical quarrels involved the Greeks.⁴⁷ In a characteristic move, Monfasani took pains to situate, or rather, to deflate provocatively, Erasmus' part in the sixteenth-century dispute over Ciceronian *usus* by putting his contributions in the context of Europe's rapidly evolving confessional polemic when stylish Ciceronian terms for the deity and for religion were more and more perceived to clash with the ontological rupture imposed by the Incarnation.⁴⁸ Monfasani argued still more strenuously about another defining Renaissance quarrel: the relationship of rhetoric to logic. While George of Trebizond's *Rhetoric* had cast logic as a "short and easy" subject, an "appendix to rhetoric,"⁴⁹ Lorenzo Valla's *Disputationes dialecticae* demoted logic still further.⁵⁰ Was Valla then a necessary precondition for the immensely successful *De inventione*

42 *George of Trebizond*, 262–4.

43 *George of Trebizond*, quoting from 253.

44 *George of Trebizond*, quoting from 270.

45 *George of Trebizond*, 289–90.

46 E.g., *George of Trebizond*, 289–92; "Episodes of Anti-Quintilianism in the Italian Renaissance" (1992); "The Ciceronian Controversy" (1999); "Renaissance Ciceronianism and Christianity" (2004). See also the place of Cicero in "The *De doctrina Christiana* and Renaissance Rhetoric" (1995).

47 See e.g., Monfasani's dense, useful survey of Western ideas from Petrarch to Ramus of "what properly constituted *usus* for a dead language" in "The Ciceronian Controversy" (1999), quoting from 195.

48 "Renaissance Ciceronianism and Christianity" (2004). Cf. "Erasmus and the Philosophers" (2012) for another deflationary take on Erasmus, now in the field of philosophy.

49 *George of Trebizond*, 301–2 and 304, on George's aim in the *Isagoge dialectica*, "the first in the series of humanist logics" (316).

50 *George of Trebizond*, *ibid.*, with 306. See also Monfasani's review-essay (1984) of Gianni Zippel, ed., *Laurentii Valle Repastinatio Dialectice et Philosophie* (1982).

dialectica of Rudolph Agricola?⁵¹ When Monfasani wrote, scholarly consensus cast Agricola as Valla's disciple – after all, Agricola had “rhetoricized logic.”⁵² Monfasani protested, however, that Valla so reduced the “status and range” of logic in comparison to that of rhetoric, that “[s]hort of eliminating logic as a valid discipline, it [would be] difficult to think of a more drastic reduction.”⁵³ Far from building on Valla's denigration of logic, Monfasani objected, Agricola methodically raised the status of logic in ways “totally incompatible with Valla's *Dialectica*.”⁵⁴ Still worse for any effort to make Agricola into Valla's disciple, even indirectly, Monfasani pointed out that the sixteenth century saw dozens of editions of Agricola's *De inventione dialectica* regularly paired with George of Trebizond's anti-Vallan, Aristotelian *Isagoge dialectica*.⁵⁵ The key point to take away – a point made repeatedly by P.O.K. and championed by Monfasani – is that in rhetoric as in philosophy and theology, neither scholasticism nor humanism were monoliths.⁵⁶ The articles in this volume reflect how thoroughly the field has adopted that interpretive key.

Religion: Theology, Patristics, Church History

Religion in the Italian Renaissance has been a growth topic for more than five decades. The field has benefited from a rich vein of Inquisition studies; from anthropological approaches to groups, space, ritual, and affect; and from attention to nuns, tertiaries, and penitents. Monfasani's contributions belong not to that institutional, cultural, or gendered history of Renaissance religion, but to the anchoring fields of Theology and Patristics. These topics, too, are approached with Kristellerian rigor. The rigor often leads to ironies: Monfasani counterbalances, for example, an intensive survey of Marsilio Ficino's pagan sources culled from Eusebius of Caesarea, with the simple observation that

51 Monfasani, “Lorenzo Valla and Rudolph Agricola” (1990), quoting from 189.

52 Ibid.; George of Trebizond, 330–1.

53 “Lorenzo Valla and Rudolph Agricola” (1990), quoting from 183–5.

54 Ibid., 189; Valla and Agricola also held opposing positions on the “extramental existence of the universals” (190–91).

55 Ibid., 191; cf. George of Trebizond, 333–6. To cap off this most basic revision, Monfasani also corrected a philosophical misprision by demonstrating that Valla and Agricola were not “true Academic skeptics” (“Lorenzo Valla and Rudolph Agricola,” 192). Monfasani did admit a link between Valla and Agricola: through both, Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana* may have had “quite a large influence on new rhetoric of the Renaissance.” See “*De Doctrina Christiana* and Renaissance Rhetoric” (1995), quoting from 180.

56 Ibid., 192. See the article by Lodi Nauta below.

Ficino extracted those quotations in support of his Plato-friendly Christianity – exactly the opposite reason that Eusebius had included the quotations in the first place.⁵⁷

No more than Platonism or Aristotelianism was Renaissance Christianity a single expression. In a revisionist article on Valla, Monfasani speaks not of some vague “religion,” but rather of the rhetorician’s “theology.”⁵⁸ By the standards of his own day, Valla was no theologian: that is, he had no professional competence in theology. Moreover, when Valla addressed the burning theological topics of the mid-fifteenth century – e.g., the power of God, free will, the Trinity, and transubstantiation⁵⁹ – he fell into inconsistencies, heresies, and trivialities. Valla was a grammarian and rhetorician, and by the standards of his own day those professional competencies authorized his interventions on ancient texts and moral philosophy. That he drove those competencies into areas he did not know, stemmed from his delight in giving offense.⁶⁰ Monfasani thus insists that the technical arguments of late medieval theologians were distinct from the *ad hoc* practice of “Christian thought” by the untrained, what is called “lay” or “vernacular theology” (although Valla was neither a layman nor writing in the vernacular).⁶¹ Such thought might be highly evocative for twentieth- and twenty-first century readers, but anachronism is not something that Kristeller did or Monfasani does countenance.

As in the case of humanist Giles of Viterbo, Monfasani often approaches Renaissance Christianity through the *realia* of individual careers. In several articles treating “[t]he *Wunderkind* of the Augustinian Order in the

57 “Marsilio Ficino and Eusebius of Caesaria’s *Praeparatio Evangelica*” (2010): the irony is sharpened by the fact that Ficino quoted from George of Trebizond’s rather free translation of a defective manuscript of the *Praeparatio Evangelica*.

58 “The Theology of Lorenzo Valla” (2000).

59 *Ibid.*, taking up a list of standard late medieval topics.

60 I refer to Valla’s Biblical *Annotationes* and his anti-mendicant *De professione religiosorum*. See “Theology of Lorenzo Valla,” at 10, for the latter treatise as Valla’s sole self-identified “theological work”; Monfasani follows Mario Fois (following note) in recognizing that Valla “never really argued theology” (12) but gave “rhetorical expression to an ethic and religious sensibility” (13). Cf. “Criticism of Biblical Humanists in Quattrocento Italy” (2008), esp. 21–28, on scholars’ efforts to find theological positions in Valla’s *Annotationes*.

61 Monfasani, “Theology of Lorenzo Valla,” 13, citing Mario Fois, *Il pensiero cristiano di Lorenzo Valla* (Rome: Università Gregoriana, 1969). Monfasani follows Ricardo Fubini’s rejection of Salvatore Camporeale’s “attempt to make a profound Christian thinker out of Valla” in *Umanesimo e teologia* (Florence: Istituto nazionale di studi sul Rinascimento, 1972); see Monfasani, “Theology of Lorenzo Valla,” 12 n. 7. Fois was a Jesuit and Camporeale a Dominican: both understood the professional competencies of theologians.

Renaissance,”⁶² Monfasani shows Giles theologizing over decades, in sermons, finding-aids, and treatises, first as bishop and then as cardinal. By temperament and early training a Ficinian Platonist, Giles was forced to acknowledge his order’s devotion to Aristotelian readings of Christian doctrine;⁶³ an Orphic Hermeticist early on, he retreated late in life into the still deeper obscurities of Christian Kabbalah.⁶⁴ Such rarified studies could not meet the challenges of the Reformation: tracing the reduction of Giles’ Platonism to irrelevance, Monfasani observes that the times called instead for creative institutional and theological leadership.

Any discussion of Monfasani’s contribution to the intellectual history of Christianity on the peninsula must acknowledge yet again the importance of his attention to the émigrés – now as copyists, translators, commentators, and authors of both theological and homiletic works. He has recovered lost works,⁶⁵ parsed the significance of unappreciated texts,⁶⁶ returned missing scholars to the history of major intellectual traditions,⁶⁷ and identified forgeries.⁶⁸ He has measured the professional terms of the East-West cultural exchange by counting and naming Byzantine émigrés and visitors who were copyists, teachers, and translators,⁶⁹ and providing in-depth studies of major authors.⁷⁰

In particular, Monfasani reveals the émigrés more fully in their roles as ecclesiastical patrons and clients. Bessarion – about whom Monfasani has written over fifteen articles⁷¹ – provides a fine instance of the light thus shed

62 Quotation from “The Augustinian Platonists” (2006), 320. See also “Sermons of Giles of Viterbo as Bishop” (1983); “Hermes Trismegistus, Rome, and the Myth of Europa” (1991);

63 For Ficinian Platonizing, see Monfasani’s observations on Giles’ commentary on Lombard’s *Sentences* in “The Augustinian Platonists” (2006); for evidence of the great effort Giles put into mastering Aristotle, see “Giles of Viterbo and the Errors of Aristotle” (2014).

64 “Giles of Viterbo as Alter Orpheus” (2007), 108.

65 E.g., “The ‘Lost’ Final Part of George Amiroutzes’ *Dialogus de Fide in Christum* and Zanobi Acciaiuoli” (2006).

66 E.g. in “Testi inediti di Bessarione e Teodoro Gaza” (1992).

67 E.g. “Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite in mid-Quattrocento Rome” (1987) argues for Theodore Gaza’s significance in the reception history of Pseudo-Dionysius.

68 In “Pletone, Bessarione e la Processione dello Spirito Santo” (1994), Monfasani rejects the attribution to Pletho of Giorgio Coressio’s pseudepigraphal treatise on the procession of the Spirit.

69 “The Greeks and Renaissance Humanism” (2012), with three appendices of lists.

70 Cf. Monfasani’s survey, “The Pro-Latin Apologetics of the Greek Émigrés to Quattrocento Italy” (2011).

71 Considering no book reviews but only articles that include the name “Bessarion” in the title, I count at least fifteen articles and a book. The number is deceptively low, because

on émigré patron-client networks. The cardinal's extensive and fluid *famiglia* or *academia*⁷² functioned simultaneously to succor émigrés, to encourage Greek-language scholarship among westerners, and to forward Bessarion's claims for the harmony of Christianity and Plato. Some striking findings result: working from annotations in a manuscript copy of George of Trebizond's Latin translation of the *Parmenides*, for instance, Monfasani proved the quality of Nicholas of Cusa's knowledge of Greek – even Nicholas profited from time in Bessarion's *famiglia*.⁷³

The Latins who passed through Bessarion's networks learned to appreciate not just the Greek language and Greek philosophy, but also the homiletic literature of the Greek Church. Monfasani discovered that four and maybe five Renaissance translators of select homilies by Basil the Great were working as clients of Bessarion.⁷⁴ Bessarion himself translated one of those homilies, in the process restoring a *Vetus Latina* reading against the *Vulgata*; the translators from Bessarion's circle picked up the restoration. Thus in a brief article (with appendices), Monfasani reconstructs a Latin-émigré ecclesiastical network, demonstrates its curiously repetitive translation practice, and analyzes its intermittently philological approach to biblical citation.⁷⁵ The jeweler is at work here.

Bessarion's success at the art of the network rested fundamentally upon his elevation to the cardinalate (1439). This piece of good fortune was possible only because, after taking a pro-Unionist stance at Ferrara-Florence (against his teacher, Gemistos Pletho), he converted to Latin Christianity.⁷⁶ No one in the late medieval Mediterranean doubted that conversion could forward a career, but the precarious situation of Byzantium made the choice urgent for members of the émigré community. Nowhere – so far as I can determine – does Monfasani address the motives of Bessarion's conversion; such interpretive

many of Monfasani's articles address members of Bessarion's circle and their contributions to *In calumniatorem Platonis*.

72 “Two Fifteenth-Century ‘Platonic Academies’: Bessarion's and Ficino's” (2011), at 61–65.

73 “Nicholas of Cusa, the Byzantines, and the Greek Language” (2002), an appendix gives Cusanus' annotations; Monfasani demonstrates Cusa's relationship to Bessarion at 222–3.

74 Monfasani, “Some Quattrocento Translators of St Basil the Great” (2008), at 253.

75 On the humanists' intermittently philological study of the Bible, cf. “Criticism of Biblical Humanists in Quattrocento Italy” (2008): while focusing on the Latins, Monfasani notes the émigrés' translations of patristic commentaries and biblical homilies (17).

76 See the following note. “The Pro-Latin Apologetics of the Greek Émigrés to Quattrocento Italy” (2011), at 170–74, discusses Bessarion's pro-Unionist writings. See also “Pletone, Bessarione, e la processione dello spirito santo” (1994); “Platonic Paganism in the Fifteenth Century” (1992) at 49 and 61 on Pletho's position.

restraint before matters of conscience suits Monfasani's evidence-based methodology.⁷⁷ It is thus a powerful moment when, with characteristic humanity, he urges scholars not to take lightly the émigrés' dilemmas in adopting Latin Christianity.⁷⁸ Not all converted or converted quickly – Argyropoulos seems to have waited till it became clear that life back home would not resume and that his professorial appointment in Florence was secure. Moreover, the Greeks who had accepted Union at Ferrara-Florence almost all changed their minds once home, and the anti-Unionist Pletho himself was, in Monfasani's reading, a neo-pagan.⁷⁹

Philosophy: The Plato-Aristotle Controversy (1439–1557)⁸⁰

Contributions to the history of rhetoric and theology notwithstanding, Monfasani works for the most part as a historian of philosophy, addressing both scholastic and humanist approaches and both Latin and Byzantine traditions. As we write this introduction, he is completing a much-awaited, full-length study of the Plato-Aristotle controversy, a topic that has occupied him since the dissertation. The central place of this controversy in Monfasani's oeuvre, and the lucid methodology that he applies to its interpretation were evident already in *George of Trebizond* and the *Collectanea* documents. Subsequent articles have illuminated the positions of the protagonists: their ancient sources and novel interpretations; the relative part that scholastic and humanistic affiliations played in their *scholae*; and of course the personal animosities that inflamed intellectual disagreements. The fifteenth-century controversy that pitted Plato against Aristotle was a “unique moment in the history of philosophy in the West,” and Monfasani has led its exploration.⁸¹

Monfasani's elucidation of theological-philosophical schools of thought – Thomism, Averroism, and Nominalism – has underlined one striking aspect

77 Cf. *George of Trebizond*, 21–2.

78 “The Greeks and Renaissance Humanism” (2012), at 43. Conversion is not the point of the article, but Monfasani's unusual pause to alert the reader to matters of conscience gives considerable edge to the central rhetorical and philosophical observations.

79 On Pletho as neo-pagan, see “Platonic Paganism in the Fifteenth Century” (1992) at 52; “Pletone, Bessarione e la Processione dello Spirito Santo” (1994), at 833.

80 Dates of the controversy from Monfasani, “Marsilio Ficino and the Plato Aristotle Controversy” (2002), 179. A broader span, reaching to Jakob Brucker's 1741 *Historia Critica Philosophiae*, appears in “The Pre- and Post-History of Cardinal Bessarion's 1469 *In calumniatorem Platonis*” (2013), at 360.

81 “Marsilio Ficino and the Plato Aristotle Controversy” (2002).

of the Greek-Latin cultural exchange. Following P.O.K., Monfasani emphasizes the scholastic bent of the émigré philosophers and theologians.⁸² “[A] significant portion of the best and brightest of the Greeks,” he points out, “found most attractive and compelling in Latin culture . . . not emerging humanism but traditional Latin scholasticism.”⁸³ Failure to appreciate this fact must “distort[] the picture of how the Greek émigrés related to Renaissance Italy.”⁸⁴ In particular, failure to appreciate the émigrés’ admiration for scholasticism makes understanding the ins and outs of the Plato-Aristotle controversy quite impossible.

Again, Bessarion is a useful example. Monfasani has enabled us to see that the “celebrated . . . patron of humanism,”⁸⁵ who was with his teacher Pletho and his sometime client Ficino the *fons et origo* of Renaissance philosophical Platonism, assembled a library almost bare of contemporary humanist writings, but heavy with over two hundred scholastic texts.⁸⁶ Bessarion “spen[t] a great deal of money”⁸⁷ on these books precisely in order to defend the harmony of Plato and Christianity in the most theologically convincing way, but he needed clients and familiars to make effective use of the collection. So, for instance, Fernando of Cordova, a Salamanca-trained Scotist who was the first Latin scholastic to pass through Bessarion’s Platonizing circle, composed an aide-mémoire and a treatise in support of Bessarion’s position (both entered the library).⁸⁸ Together, the efforts of Latin scholastic theologian Giovanni Gatti, OP, and of Latin humanist stylist Niccolò Perotti folded scholastic expertise into the *In calumniatorem Platonis* (*ICP*) in admirable prose.⁸⁹

Just as the person George of Trebizond powerfully organized Monfasani’s research agenda right from the start, Bessarion’s *ICP* (first pub. 1469) is the single piece of textual evidence that has had a similar effect. It appeared as

82 See also *George of Trebizond*, 305–13, for ways in which George’s small logic textbook, the *Isagoge dialectica*, responds to late medieval scholasticism.

83 “The Averroism of John Argyropoulos” demonstrates, for example, that Argyropoulos’ *Quaestio* depends heavily on Gaetano da Thiene, student of logician Paul of Venice.

84 “Greeks and Renaissance Humanism” (2012) at 40.

85 “Cardinal Bessarion’s Greek and Latin Sources” (2012), 470.

86 *Bessarion scholasticus* (2012), with twelve appendices. See 7–18 on the humanist library; scholastic texts in Appendix I; and 75 codices of classical works in Appendix III.

87 “Cardinal Bessarion’s Greek and Latin Sources” (2012), 470.

88 *Bessarion Scholasticus*, at 33–4; the treatise is now lost. See further *Fernando of Cordova* (2011), 23–40, and 143.

89 “Giovanni Gatti of Messina” (1997); “Niccolò Perotti and Bessarion’s *In Calumniatorem Platonis*” (2011), and also “Bessarion Latinus” (1981), “Still more on Bessarion Latinus” (1983); and many more. See further below.

calculated response to George of Trebizond's *Comparatio Philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis*, the treatise that aimed to make a Greek philosophical controversy into a European affair⁹⁰ by warning "of the devastating effect that the Platonic contagion . . . would have on religion and politics," as a "great apocalyptic drama" unfolded a real "neopagan conspiracy."⁹¹ To answer this frontal attack on Plato, Bessarion carefully "buried Trebizond in anonymity,"⁹² but also added, rearranged, and supervised major revisions of the *ICP*, which had first been drafted a decade before publication. In a painstaking series of articles, Monfasani has established the complex textual history of *ICP*, as Bessarion brought all his networking resources to bear on the project.⁹³

Monfasani's focus on the making of the *ICP* has led to major re-evaluations of the participants. Theodore Gaza, for instance, was among the émigrés recruited by Bessarion; Monfasani has promised a monograph on this intriguing figure.⁹⁴ Gaza has a mixed record at seeking upward mobility by taking on a range of intellectual assignments. On one hand, he was a "serious and sophisticated scholar of Aristotle," translating Aristotle's zoological texts, Theophrastus' *On Plants*, and Alexander of Aphrodisias' *Problemata*.⁹⁵ The translations of *De Animalibus* and the *Problemata* held the field in Europe for a remarkably long period,⁹⁶ while the *Problemata* in particular proves that Gaza was a text-critic "literally before his time."⁹⁷ On the other hand, the *Antirrheticon* against Argyropoulos reveals only an "intellectual courtier" spouting a "stream of irrelevancies and inconsistencies" in defense of his patron, Bessarion.⁹⁸ And

90 "Cardinal Bessarion's Greek and Latin Sources" (2012), 470; cf. *George of Trebizond*, e.g., 156. George argued on a previous occasion that Theodore Gaza led a conspiracy "to replace Christianity with a filthy paganism" as Pletho's Platonizing aimed to do (155).

91 *Ibid.*, 470; *George of Trebizond*, 155; 162.

92 *George of Trebizond*, 221.

93 See "A Tale of Two Books: Bessarion's *In Calumniatorem Platonis* and George of Trebizond's *Comparatio Philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis*" (2008) for a good introduction.

94 "L'insegnamento universitario e la cultura bizantina in Italia nel Quattrocento" (1990 = 1991), 45 n. 11.

95 "The Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata* and Aristotle's *De Animalibus* in the Renaissance" (1999), 217.

96 On Gaza's "virtual monopoly of the *Problemata* and *De animalibus*" see *ibid.*, 205 and *passim*.

97 *Ibid.*, 210. See also "Angelo Poliziano, Aldo Manuzio, Theodore Gaza, George of Trebizond and Chapter 90 of the *Miscellaneorum Centuria Prima* (with an Edition and Translation)" (2006) and "George of Trebizond's Critique of Theodore Gaza's Translation of the Aristotelian *Problemata*" (2006).

98 "Greek and Latin Learning in Theodore Gaza's *Antirrheticon*" (2000), quoting from 76 and 71 respectively.

while Bessarion tried through various assignments to bring Gaza into the *ICP* project, nothing of weight resulted. This client proved to be more important as a translator than as a philosopher.⁹⁹ Monfasani's forthcoming book promises many more fine-grained re-evaluations of this sort.

• • •

An appreciation of John Monfasani's scholarship concludes fittingly with recognition of Paul Oskar Kristeller's influence as teacher, mentor, friend, and model. The influence, of course, was not just on Monfasani but directly on at least two generations of scholars, and now indirectly on still others. Monfasani is the keeper of the shrine. His devotion appears in a wide variety of writings: notes on the "Kristeller Thesis" (2000);¹⁰⁰ a remarkable discussion of Kristeller's contribution to the study of Renaissance manuscripts;¹⁰¹ a biographical preface and longer biographical article;¹⁰² an edited book, *Kristeller Reconsidered* (2006); and several obituaries.¹⁰³ Very nearly every study by Monfasani can be counted on to refer to Kristeller's scholarship, and not just in the notes: "This paper simply updates some aspects of Kristeller's article," declares the first paragraph of Monfasani's revisionist argument about Nicholas of Cusa's Greek.¹⁰⁴ Monfasani does not always agree with his mentor.¹⁰⁵ But as the obituaries show, he pays homage to one of the great scholars of the twentieth century by bestowing on Kristeller's memory the same exquisite care that Kristeller applied to the Renaissance intellectuals.

• • •

Sixteen celebratory articles are gathered in this volume, *Essays in Renaissance Thought and Letters* – the title is an homage to Kristeller and thus to Monfasani. The articles are grouped by format according to the 'genres' in which Monfasani himself regularly publishes. These are, first, the brief, learned note, here represented by five contributions; second, the scholarly article, represented

99 "Theodore Gaza as Philosopher: A Preliminary Survey" esp. 273–81, surveying several of Gaza's writings for Bessarion, with a ringing conclusion.

100 "Toward the Genesis of the Kristeller Thesis of Renaissance Humanism" (2000).

101 "Manuscripts" (2006).

102 "Paul Oskar Kristeller—A Life in Learning" (2006); "The Many Lives of Paul Oskar Kristeller" (2006).

103 See the catalogue below for 1999, 2001.

104 "Nicholas of Cusa, the Byzantines, and the Greek Language," at 215.

105 For instance, on Pletho's neopaganism: see "Platonic Paganism" (1992) at 46.

by seven contributions; and third, the lengthy exploration, here, four contributions. Within the three categories, a roughly chronological order prevails. Though readers are bound to turn first to their favorite authors and subjects, those attentive to the whole will perceive satisfying, organic connections flowing through the volume – above all a decidedly textual focus, an alertness to scholarly networks, great philological precision, and a deep sense of history's ironies.

The "Notes" section opens fittingly with Concetta Bianca's "Byzantines at Rome in the Fifteenth Century," for she and John have joined in underlining the marginal status of the newcomers, to demolish the stereotypical image of the Byzantines as a primary cause of the Renaissance. Bianca surveys the difficulties faced by the immigrants. At Rome, so long as they were useful, Byzantines might be tolerated in curial *famiglie*; when toleration declined, they moved, then moved again. Even as curial translators and copyists, the immigrants failed to acquire permanent positions. Some humanist circles disdained knowledge of Greek altogether, and the establishment of a Greek press in Leo X's Rome was accomplished entirely without Greeks.

There follow two "Notes" on the book-hunting of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini. Methodologically, both reflect John's precise attention to the historical conditions of Renaissance learning, and as often in John's work that sort of close focus produces ironies. In "Badgering for Books," Thomas Izbicki presents the young Aeneas at work in the imperial chancery. Hoping to acquire Leonardo Bruni's translation of Aristotle's *Politics*, Aeneas cultivated for years an epistolary friendship with a papal secretary. Once he finally possessed the work, however, Aeneas hardly drew on it. Pointing out that Aeneas's difficulty procuring the *Politics* bespeaks a little-appreciated failure of supply beyond humanist nodes such as Florence, Izbicki wryly observes that Bruni's translation first entered print only after Pius II's death, and not on the peninsula, but in Strasbourg.

David Rundle, in "Heralds of Antiquity," catches Aeneas perpetrating a false etymology of the word "herald." This bit of pseudo-learning derived from a visit to St. Paul's Cathedral in London during the 1430s. There, or so Aeneas claimed in a letter written some twenty years later, he had copied the critical passage from "an elegant Latin version of Thucydides." The claim was risibly fraudulent: in fact, the passage derived from Pier Paolo Vergerio's translation of Arrian's *Indica*. What was Aeneas up to? Rundle suggests that the learned lie commented ironically on the whole humanist project of "archival archeology." Let him who knows, know.

Next is Christopher Celenza's "Petrus Crinitus and Ancient Latin Poetry." Surveying the mature works to suggest Crinitus's significance as a transitional figure, Celenza proposes that he carried forward Poliziano's scholarly ideals

into the early sixteenth century.¹⁰⁶ In *On Latin Poets*, Crinitus addresses writers from the early third century BCE to the late fifth century CE, delineating in the process “a specific vision of the place and evolution of poetry in society”: its quality rises and declines with the quality of political attention to literature. Reviewing Crinitus’s manuscript annotations, Celenza discovers the scholar even in his adolescence concerned to collect and systematize obscure vocabulary and difficult references. Such practices ensured the utility of *On Latin Poets* until the eighteenth century.

The “Notes” section closes with Peter Mack paying homage to John’s work in the field of rhetoric. In “Erasmus’s Use of George Trapezuntius,” Mack demonstrates that the Dutch scholar’s instruction on letters of persuasion in *De conscribendis epistolis* derives largely from the Byzantine émigré’s *Rhetoricorum libri quinque*. Other parts of Erasmus’ letter-writing manual depend on Cicero’s *De inventione*, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, and Quintilian’s *Institutio oratoria*. Such borrowing and revising was standard practice among compilers of rhetorical textbooks: George had done it, too. Nonetheless, by careful attention to select passages, Mack shows how skillfully Erasmus cut, expanded, and clarified George’s instruction.

Section two, entitled “Essays,” features seven contributions. Chronologically, they range from Late Antiquity to the Enlightenment; in disciplinary terms, they address socio-economics, patristics, philosophy, politics, literature, religion, and intellectual culture; geographically, they reach from Constantinople to Paris by way of Hungary, Greece, North Africa, Spain, the Holy Roman Empire, and of course Italy – even Florence. These spans bear witness to the catholicity of John’s interests, to the map of his research travels, and to the weight of his scholarly influence.

Monfasani’s abiding care to understand the émigrés in their socio-economic and familial contexts gives special interest to David Jacoby’s contribution, “The Byzantine Social Elite and the Market Economy, Eleventh to Fifteenth Century.” Jacoby challenges the scholarly consensus that Byzantine elites, who certainly shared a conservative economic ideology, unanimously disdained trade in practice. He proposes instead that already in the late eleventh century provincial and Constantinopolitan elites drove the developing market economy. Elites turn up as “middlemen and wholesalers” capable of integrating dependent peasant producers as well as lay and monastic estate managers into profit-oriented economies of scale. Provincial *archontes* even spearheaded the

106 We know the lost works from a letter by Benedetto Riccardini, a figure who features in Robert Black’s contribution to this volume: Crinito and Riccardini may have studied together under Poliziano.

establishment of manufactures, while inside the capitol, dignitaries sought to profit from guild activities, and emperors themselves invested in external exchange. Jacoby's revised model of the medieval Byzantine economy downplays Italian involvement in favor of native elite activism.

In "George of Trebizond, Renaissance Libertarian?" James Hankins focuses on Monfasani's favorite émigré to clarify George's "singularly neglected" political thought. Drawing on the *Comparatio philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis*, Hankins proposes that George's socio-economic policy preferences make him a prophet of modern cosmopolitanism, as his views on personal liberty make him a prophet of libertarianism. George's cosmopolitanism probably drew on his own experience as an 'alien,' but its talking points, so to speak, came chiefly from Aelius Aristides – enhanced by George's rejection of trade barriers and promotion of meritocracy, not to mention his plan to institute global Christianity. George's views on personal liberty derived from his anti-platonic psychology and led him to assert that humans must be free to choose their own ends. His unique positions should enlarge our "current narratives of political thought."

In "The School of San Lorenzo, Niccolò Machiavelli, Paolo Sassi, and Benedetto Riccardini," Robert Black brings new archival documents to bear on the question of young Niccolò's education. First, these documents allow Black to resolve a recent and sensational dispute concerning the child's victimization by his teacher Paolo Sassi. Second, they undergird Black's identification of San Lorenzo schoolteacher Benedetto Riccardini as Niccolò's advanced Latin prose teacher. Thus Black fills out the heretofore incomplete history of Machiavelli's education. Still more important, he reveals the resolutely secular classroom stance of these teachers – despite the fact that all but the very first were ecclesiastics. Black proposes that the secular curricula of the ecclesiastical teachers, not to mention Niccolò's experience of priestly abuse, confirmed Machiavelli in his anti-clerical and anti-Christian tendencies.

Sándor Bene celebrates Monfasani's polemical essay "The Renaissance as the Concluding Phase of the Middle Ages." In "Renaissance Sources in Medieval Mirrors for Princes," Bene analyzes the mixture of scholastic and humanist textual borrowings in two *specula principis* by the mid-fifteenth century Carthusian Andreas Pannonius, of Ferrara. Andreas recognized the problem of reconciling the political/active and theological/contemplative virtues: the ruler's happiness (*felicitas*) in practical politics could not be that happiness (*beatitudo*) promised in heaven. Andreas' solution is not 'medieval' but remarkably up-to-date. In his first mirror for princes, *De regis virtutibus*, Andreas drew not only on the scholastic Giles of Rome, but also on his contemporary Bornio da Sala's platonizing *De principe* and Petrarch's *Seniles* to uphold the place

of royal *caritas* and *amor* in securing the state's peace. His second mirror for princes, *Ad Herculem*, goes further. Proposing "*beatificatio* through political virtues," Andreas combines a Scotist will-centered theology with yet more extensive quotation of Petrarch, to yield a "theologically optimistic approach to the *vita activa* of the ruler." Petrarch, Bene proposes, led Andreas from Thomism to Scotism, and thus underwrote Andreas' harmony of Cicero and Scripture. The "strong paradigms" of periodization that have obstructed appreciation of Andreas' achievement have also impeded analysis of Hungary's Renaissance.

In "Marsilio Ficino as a Reader of Proclus and Most Notably of Proclus's *In Parmenidem*," Michael Allen honors Monfasani in the most meaningful way: as a student of Kristeller, that is, as a historian of philosophy. Allen shows that Ficino learned from Proclus in two important areas. First, Ficino grasped Proclus's account of the "series of breakthroughs" that constitute the early reception history of the enigmatic *Parmenides*. Proclus thus helped Ficino understand the history of Platonic metaphysics. Second, Ficino borrowed from Proclus the defense of Plato's mixture of dialectic and theology in the *Parmenides* as "serious play" with "figures and veils" about the One. Proclus thus helped Ficino preserve a certain metaphysical interpretation of the dialogue. At the same time, Ficino distinguished himself from Proclus by further developing the early history of *Parmenides* interpretation and by explicitly rejecting some of those readings. He disagreed on one hand that the text was "just a logical exercise" and on the other that it required a literal reading because every word and phrase stood as "a theological cipher." Against Proclus, Ficino insisted that Plato was a "poetic philosopher" who required a "flexible, intuitive" reader. Dionysius was such a reader: his apophatic "serious play" transcended even poetry. Ficino, of course, did not know that "Dionysius" drew on Proclus.

What has renaissance humanism to do with medieval nominalism? Monfasani would caution against facile answers. In "De-essentializing the World: Valla, Agricola, Vives, and Nizolio on Universals and Topics" Lodi Nauta concurs by tracing four case studies that demonstrate the fundamental difficulty of the question. He finds that Lorenzo Valla, Rudolf Agricola, Juan Luis Vives, and Mario Nizolio never engage the mental concepts that ground Ockham's nominalism; the humanists are grammarians and rhetoricians, even in their attention to logic. Valla's Aristotle is not Ockham's; Agricola is a realist; Vives can be described as both a realist and a nominalist; and although Nizolio discusses *nominales*, his purposes have to do with rhetorical *loci*, not scholastic nominalism. All these men based their arguments in Cicero, Quintilian, and Boethius – not in the late-scholastic nominalists. Why then have humanists and nominalists come to be associated at all? Nauta points to an older but

still influential “Whiggish” historiography that represented both schools of thought as undermining Aristotelianisms and thus enabling the Reformation and Scientific Revolution. And yet, the humanists did indeed have a grammatical and rhetorical stance that resulted in a “horizontal ontology” based on empirical observation: the scholastics’ “hierarchies of universals” yielded to the *intellectus communis* and the *sensus communis*.

April Shelford looks at another foundational scholarly dilemma in “Pierre-Daniel Huet and Josephus’ *Testimonium Flavianum*”: could the historical truth of the divinely revealed New Testament be proven? To accomplish this feat, Huet’s *Demonstratio Evangelica* employed a geometrico-historical method – maxims, definitions, propositions, and axioms set out to answer Descartes’ rejection of historical knowledge as mere opinion. A key requirement for success, however, was extra-textual confirmation not just of Jesus’ existence but of his divinity. Huet judged one text reliable for this purpose: the *Testimonium Flavianum* found in the *Antiquities* of the Jewish historian Josephus. Shelford explicates Huet’s labors to extract support for geometric propositions from the *Testimonium*, whose authenticity was hotly contested. In the end, Huet’s text-critical labors could not save the *Testimonium*; more seriously, his geometrico-historical method failed. Still worse, because Huet worked with such conscientious thoroughness, his failure was equally thorough, and proved Descartes right.

Part 3, “Extended Discussions and Editions” gathers four pieces. Two analyze the reception of texts: first, Xenophanes’s fragment B39, and second, the *opera* of Lactantius. Two introduce *editiones principes* of significant sources: Andreas Chrysoberges’ *Dialogue* in favor of Church Union, and Symphorien Champier’s curiously nominalist *Isagoge*. All together, these considerably longer contributions honor John Monfasani’s interests in intellectual history, and above all his attention to texts and transmissions.

John Demetracopoulos’s “Christian Scepticism: The Reception of Xenophanes B34” traces the *fortuna* of the famous sixth-century BC fragment, “the earliest extant philosophical pronouncement of some form of sceptical epistemology.” Thinkers from Protagoras and Isocrates, not to mention Plato and Aristotle, had, of course, discussed it. A new adaptation emerged, however, in the third-second century BC Academy, when the fragment was cast as a humble confession of human ignorance. This reading, preserved and praised by Arius Didymus, Philo of Alexandria, Varro, Seneca and Plutarch, was adopted and adapted by Greek and Latin Christians, including Lactantius, Gregory Nazianzen, and Theodoret of Cyrus. After a long silence, philosophical Scepticism was then revived in Late Byzantium, e.g., in Nicephoros Gregoras’ borrowing of Philo of Alexandria’s mixture of Scepticism with Platonism, and

in Gregory Palamas's brief history of atheism in Antiquity. In the fifteenth century, George Scholarios – Gennadios II, expounding Thomas Aquinas' doctrine of the limits of human reason, had recourse, inter alia, to Xenophanes's fragment. Finally, George Gemistos or Pletho launched a direct attack against the fragment itself and its Christian adoption, which he deemed an insult to human dignity.

In "Lactantius Philosophus?" David Rutherford reviews the changing meanings of 'philosophy' through the reception history of Lactantius' surviving works. In Late Antiquity, attentive early readers included Constantine, Jerome, and Isidore of Seville, but by the ninth century, few manuscripts of Lactantius's works were extant. When manuscript production recommenced in the twelfth century, the *Institutes* predominated. The scholastics knew Lactantius mostly through references in Augustine's *City of God*; Aquinas, too, had only indirect knowledge of his theological positions. Thirteenth-century Parisian theologian Gilbert of Tournai's *Rudimentum doctrinae* suggests, however, that the *Institutes* was becoming better known. Like Isidore, Gilbert represented Lactantius as a champion of philosophy – a representation quite contrary to Lactantius' actual stance. Some fourteenth- and fifteenth-century readers expressed concerns about Lactantius' orthodoxy, but full expression awaited Franciscan Antonio da Rho's controversial *Three Dialogues against Lactantius*. Repeated publication of the *Three Dialogues* in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries drew readers, editors, and publishers to Lactantius. One particularly successful avenue of Lactantius' ingress was Albrecht von Eyb's 1459 *Margarita poetica*. Lactantius' complex position in early Christian-philosophical polemic was of less interest to medieval and renaissance scholars than the use they could make of him for their own projects.

Among the many polemical texts born from the union of the Greek and Latin Churches so briefly achieved at the Council of Florence was a *Dialogue* by Andreas Chrysoberges, given here in its *editio princeps* by Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel. The *Dialogue* responds to a letter from Archbishop Mark Eugenikos attacking the Catholic Church as a fount of heresies. Andreas seems to have sought a wide audience for his rebuttal by writing a Latin dialogue. He answers Mark's accusations regarding, e.g., the Eucharist, the Trinity, the Creator-creation relationship, the Incarnation, and the interpretation of the Greek Fathers. When Mark asserts that God will turn the lies and innovations of the Council of Florence to good, Andreas retorts *ad hominem*: the ingrate Mark will burn in hell with the heresiarchs.

In "Notes from a Nominalist in a New Incunabulum by Symphorien Champier" Brian Copenhaver and Thomas Ward present an edition and translation of the humanist physician's introductory textbook on grammar and

logic. The *Isagoge* ([Lyon: Pierre Mareschal], s.a.), an octavo of sixteen leaves, is extant in few copies. It appears to be a hasty publication: its grammatical theory is modist, but its logic, nominalist; at one point, its actual tripartite structure is subordinated to a conceptual five-part structure; and the volume concludes with apparently irrelevant material. Its scholastic positions on logic and grammar contrast so disquietingly with Champier's better-known *Gateway to Logic and Science* (1498) that the *Isagoge* must have been printed before that embrace of medicine and humanism expressed in the *Gateway* and elaborated in all Champier's subsequent publications. Copenhaver and Ward invite incubable specialists to sort out the facts of the matter.

• • •

We offer this enormous and colorful bouquet of scholarship
to John Monfasani,
scholar, teacher, administrator, colleague, and friend.

Publications by John Monfasani, 1969–2014

1969

Translation

(With John C. Olin) Gasparo Contarini, *De officio episcopi*, in John C. Olin, *The Catholic Reformation: Savonarola to Ignatius Loyola* (New York: Harper Row, 1969), 90–106.

1976

Book

George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1976). Pp. xii + 414.

1978

Review

Charles Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1977), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 31 (1978): 349–52.

1981

Articles

“Il Perotti e la controversia tra platonici ed aristotelici,” *Res Publica Litterarum* 4 (1981): 195–231.

“Bessarion Latinus,” *Rinascimento* s. 2, 21 (1981): 165–209.

Review

John O'Malley, *Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome: Rhetoric, Doctrine, and Reform in the Sacred Orators of the Papal Court, c. 1450–1521* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 1979), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 34 (1981): 229–32.

1982

Reviews

- Lotte Labowsky, *Bessarion's Library and the Biblioteca Marciana: Six Inventories* (Rome: Storia e Letterature, 1979), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 35 (1982): 265–67.
- Scrittura, biblioteche e stampa a Roma nel Quattrocento: aspetti e problemi. Atti del Seminario 1–2 giugno 1979* (Vatican City: Scuola Vaticana di Paleografia, 1979), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 35 (1982): 267–69.

1983

Articles

- “Still More on Bessarion Latinus,” *Rinascimento* s. 2, 23 (1983): 217–35.
- “The Bessarion Missal Revisited,” *Scriptorium* 37 (1983): 119–22.
- “Sermons of Giles of Viterbo as Bishop,” in *Egidio da Viterbo, O.S.A. e il suo tempo. Atti del V Convegno dell'Istituto Storico Agostiniano, Roma – Viterbo, 20–23 ottobre 1982*. Studia Augustiniana Historica, 9 (Rome: Analecta Augustiniana, 1983): 137–89.
- “The Byzantine Rhetorical Tradition and the Renaissance,” in *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley–Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), 174–87.
- “A Description of the Sistine Chapel under Pope Sixtus IV,” *Artibus et Historiae* 7 (1983): 9–18.

Review

- David R. Ruderman, *The World of a Renaissance Jew: The Life and Thought of Abraham ben Mordecai Farissol* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1981), in *Journal of Modern History* 55 (1983): 552–54.

1984

Book

- Collectanea Trapezuntiana. Texts, Documents, and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond*. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 25. The Renaissance Society of America: Renaissance Texts Series, 8 (Binghamton NY: MRTS, 1984). Pp. xxii + 863.

Article

“Alexius Celadenus and Ottaviano Ubaldini: An Epilogue to Bessarion's Relationship with the Court of Urbino,” *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 46 (1984): 95–110.

Review Essay

Laurentii Valle Repastinatio Dialectice et Philosophie, ed. Giuseppe Zippel (Padua: Antenore, 1982), in *Rivista di letteratura italiana* 2 (1984): 177–94.

1985

Article

“A Philosophical Text of Andronicus Callistus Misattributed to Nicholas Secundinus,” in *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Craig Hugh Smyth*, ed. Andrew Morragh, 2 vols. (Florence: Giunti Barbera, 1985), II, 395–406.

1986

Conference Discussion

“Preambolo alla Cappella Sistina,” with Eve Borsook et al., in *Tecnica e stile: esempi di pittura murale del Rinascimento italiano*, ed. Eve Borsook and Fiorella Superbi Gioffredi, 2 vols. (Florence: Silvana Editore, 1986), I, 69–72.

Review

Ronald G. Witt, *Hercules at the Crossroads: The Life, Works, and Thought of Coluccio Salutati* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 1983), in *The Catholic Historical Review* 91 (1986): 75–76.

1987

Book

Supplementum Festivum: Studies in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller. Ed. with James Hankins and Frederick Purnell, Jr., *Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies*, 49 (Binghamton NY: MRTS, 1987). Pp. xxviii + 630.

Article

- "Platina, Capranica, and Perotti: Bessarion's Latin Eulogists and His Date of Birth," in *Bartolomeo Sacchi Il Platina (Piadena 1421 – Roma 1481): Atti del convegno internazionale di studi per il v centenario (Cremona, 14–15 novembre 1981)*, ed. Paola Medioli Masotti (Padua: Antenore, 1986 [recte 1987]), 97–136.
- "Three Notes on Renaissance Rhetoric," *Rhetorica* 5 (1987): 107–118.
- "Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite in Mid-Quattrocento Rome," in *Supplementum Festivum. Studies in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, eds. James Hankins, John Monfasani, and Frederick Purnell, Jr. (Binghamton NY: MRTS, 1987), 189–219.
- "For the History of Marsilio Ficino's Translation of Plato: The Revision Mistakenly Attributed to Ambrogio Flandino, Simon Grynaeus' Revision of 1532, and the Anonymous Revision of 1556/1557," *Rinascimento* s. 2, 27 (1987): 293–99.

1988

Articles

- "Humanism and Rhetoric," in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, ed. Albert Rabil, Jr., 3 vols., (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), III, 171–235.
- "The First Call for Press Censorship: Niccolò Perotti, Giovanni Andrea Bussi, Antonio Moreto and the Editing of Pliny's *Natural History*," *Renaissance Quarterly* 41 (1988): 1–31.
- "Calfurnio's Identification of Pseudepigrapha of Ognibene, Fenestella, and Trebizond, and His Attack on Renaissance Commentaries," *Renaissance Quarterly* 41 (1988): 32–43.
- "Was Lorenzo Valla An Ordinary Language Philosopher?" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 50 (1988): 309–23; reprinted in *Renaissance Essays II*, ed. William J. Connell (Rochester NY: MRTS, 1993), 86–100.
- "Bessarion, Valla, Agricola, and Erasmus," *Rinascimento* s. 2, 28 (1988): 319–20.

Review Essay

- Laurentii Valle De Professione Religiosorum*, ed. Mariarosa Cortesi (Padua: Antenore, 1986), in *Rivista di letteratura italiana* 5 (1988): 351–65.

Reviews

- Christopher M. Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 41 (1988): 116–19.

Claudio Finzi, *Matteo Palmieri: Dalla "Vita Civile" alla "Città di Vita"* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1984) in *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 50 (1988): 216–17.

Barry Collett, *Italian Benedictine Scholars and the Reformation: The Congregation of Santa Giustina of Padua* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), in *Journal of Religious History* 15 (1988): 149–50.

1989

Article

"Bernardo Giustiniani and Alfonso de Palencia: Their Hands, and Some New Texts, and Translations," *Scriptorium* 42 (1989): 223–38.

1990

Articles

"Lorenzo Valla and Rudolph Agricola," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 28 (1990): 181–200; reprinted without notes and with elipses in the main text in *Renaissance Thought. A Reader*, ed. Robert Black (London: Routledge, 2001), 255–62.

"In Praise of Ognibene and Blame of Guarino: Andronicus Contoblacas' Invective against Niccolò Botano and the Citizens of Brescia," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 52 (1990): 309–21.

1991

Book

Studies on Renaissance Society and Culture in Honor of Eugene F. Rice, Jr. Ed. with Ronald Musto (New York: Italica Press, 1991). Pp. xxiv + 312.

Articles

"L'insegnamento universitario e la cultura bizantina in Italia nel Quattrocento," in *Sapere e/è potere. Discipline, Dispute e Professioni nell'Università Medievale e Moderna: Il caso bolognese a confronto. Atti del 4° Convegno. Bologna, 13–15 aprile 1989*, ed. Luisa Avellini, Angela De Benedictis, and Andrea Cristiani, 3 vols. (Bologna: Istituto per la Storia di Bologna, 1990 [recte 1991]), I, 43–65.

"The Fraticelli and Clerical Wealth in Quattrocento Rome," in *Renaissance Society and Culture: Essays in Honor of Eugene F. Rice, Jr.*, ed. John Monfasani and Ronald Musto (New York: Italica Press, 1991), 177–95.

"Hermes Trismegistus, Rome, and the Myth of Europa: An Unknown Text of Giles of Viterbo," *Viator* 22 (1991): 311–42.

"A Theologian at the Roman Curia in the Mid-Quattrocento: A Bio-bibliographical Study of Niccolò Palmieri, O.S.A.," *Analecta Augustiniana* 54 (1991): 321–81.

Letter

Response to Robert Baldwin's "Kristeller's Disappearing Curriculum" in *Renaissance News & Notes* 4, 3 (Autumn 1991): 18.

1992

Book

Fernando of Cordova: A Biographical and Intellectual Profile. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society. Vol. 82, Part 6 (Philadelphia: APA, 1992). Pp. viii + 116.

Articles

"A Theologian at the Roman Curia in the Mid-Quattrocento: A Bio-bibliographical Study of Niccolò Palmieri, O.S.A.," *Analecta Augustiniana* 55 (1992): 5–98.

"Platonic Paganism in the Fifteenth Century," in *Reconsidering the Renaissance*, ed. Mario A. Di Cesare, (Binghamton NY: MRTS, 1992), 45–61.

"Testi inediti di Bessarione e Teodoro Gaza," in *Dotti bizantini e libri greci nell'Italia del secolo xv: Atti del Convegno internazionale, Trento 22–23 ottobre 1990*, ed. Mariarosaria Cortesi and Enrico V. Maltese (Naples: M. D'Auria, 1992), 231–56.

"Episodes of Anti-Quintilianism in the Italian Renaissance: Quarrels on the Orator as a *Vir Bonus* and Rhetoric as the *Scientia Bene Dicendi*," *Rhetorica* 10 (1992): 119–38.

Reviews

Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine (Palaeologan) and Italian Renaissances and the Byzantine and Roman Churches* (Madison WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), in *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991): 375–76.

George W. McClure, *Sorrow and Consolation in Italian Humanism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 45 (1992): 140–42.

Donald Kelley, *Renaissance Humanism* (Boston: Twayne, 1991), in *The American Historical Review* 97 (1992): 1510–11.

Josef IJsewijn, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 45 (1992): 839–41.

1993

Articles

“The Averroism of John Argyropoulos and His *Quaestio utrum intellectus humanus sit perpetuus*,” *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance* 5 (1993): 157–208.

“Aristotelians, Platonists, and the Missing Ockhamists: Philosophical Liberty in Pre-Reformation Italy,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 46 (1993): 247–76.

“Introduction” to *Incunabula: The Printing Revolution in Europe, 1455–1500. Incunabula Unit 2: The Classics in Translation*, editor-in-chief Lotte Hellinga (Reading U.K.: Research Publications, 1993), 13–17.

Review

Michael J. Allen, *Icastes: Marsilio Ficino's Interpretation of Plato's "Sophist,"* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989) in *The Journal of the History of Philosophy* 31 (1993): 112–14.

1994

Book

Language and Learning in Renaissance Italy: Selected Essays (Aldershot, U.K.: Variorum, 1994). Pp. xii + 340.

Articles

“Pletone, Bessarione e la processione dello Spirito Santo: un testo inedito e un falso,” in *Firenze e il Concilio del 1439. Convegno di Studi, Firenze, 29 novembre–2 dicembre 1989*, ed. Paolo Viti, 2 vols. (Florence: Olschki, 1994), 11: 833–59.

“Bessarion's Ὅτι ἡ φύσις βουλευέται (*Quod Natura Consulto Agat*) in MS Vat. Gr. 1720,” in *Bessarione e l'Umanesimo. Catalogo della mostra*, ed. Gianfranco Fiaccadori (Naples: Vivarium, 1994), 323–24.

“L'insegnamento di Teodoro Gaza a Ferrara,” in *Alla corte degli Estensi: filosofia, arte e cultura a Ferrara nei secoli XV e XVI. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Ferrara, 5–7 marzo 1992*, ed. Marco Bertozzi (Ferrara: Università degli Studi, 1994), 5–17.

Reviews

Martin Lowry, *Nicholas Jenson and the Rise of Venetian Publishing in Renaissance Europe* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), in *The Journal of Modern History* 66 (1994): 402–04.

Nigel G. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 47 (1994): 404–06.

Christian Mouchel, *Cicéron et Sénèque dans la rhétorique de la Renaissance* (Marburg: Hitzeroth, 1990), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 47 (1994): 641–44.

1995

Book

Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and Other Emigrés: Selected Essays (Aldershot, U.K.: Variorum, 1995). Pp. xii + 353.

Article

"The *De Doctrina Christiana* and Renaissance Rhetoric," in *Reading and Wisdom: The De Doctrina Christiana of Augustine in the Middle Ages*, ed. Edward D. English (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995), 172–88.

Reviews

Philip Jacks, *The Antiquarian and the Myth of Antiquity: The Origins of Rome in Renaissance Thought* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993) in *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 57 (1995): 198–99.

Peter Mack, *Renaissance Argument: Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic* (Leiden: Brill, 1993) in *Rhetorica* 13 (1995): 91–97.

1996

Review

Dominick A. Iorio, *The Aristotelians of Renaissance Italy: A Philosophical Exposition* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1991) in *Renaissance Quarterly* 49 (1996): 172.

1997

Articles

"Giovanni Gatti of Messina: A Profile and an Unedited Text," in *Filologia umanistica per Gianvito Resta*, ed. Vincenzo Fera and Gianvito Ferrà, 3 vols. (Padua: Antenore, 1997), II: 1315–38.

"Erasmus, the Roman Academy, and Ciceronianism: Battista Casali's *Invective*," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 17 (1997): 19–54.

Translation

Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts, ed. Jill Kraye, 2 vols.

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). "Juan Luis Vives" I: 91–107.

"Philip Melanchthon," I: 108–119.

"Antonius de Waele," I: 120–29.

With Luc Deitz, "Cardinal Bessarion," I: 133–46.

"Francesco de' Vieri," I: 166–76.

"George of Trebizond," II: 128–34.

Reviews

Emil J. Polak, *Medieval and Renaissance Letter Treatises and Form Letters. A Census of Manuscripts*, vols. I and II (Leiden: Brill, 1993–1994), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 50 (1997): 591–94.

Herbert Hunger, *Prochoros Kydones. Übersetzung von acht Briefen des Hl. Augustinus* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984), in *Byzantine Studies/Études Byzantines* n. s., 1–2 (1996–97): 260–61.

1998

Article

"Humanism," in cooperation with Brian Copenhaver, in *The Columbia History of Western Philosophy*, ed. Richard H. Popkin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 292–303.

Review

Charles G. Nauert, Jr., *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995) in *The International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 5 (1998): 302–04.

Encyclopedia Articles

"George of Trebizond," in *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 10 vols. (London–New York: Routledge, 1998), IV: 34–36.

"Humanism," IV: 533–41.

"Petrarca, Francesco," VII: 326–29.

"Valla, Lorenzo," IX: 568–73.

1999

Articles

- "The Ciceronian Controversy," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. Vol. III: *The Renaissance*, ed. Glyn P. Norton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 395–401.
- "The Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata* and Aristotle's *De Animalibus* in the Renaissance," in *Natural Particulars: Nature and the Disciplines in Renaissance Europe*, ed. Anthony Grafton and Nancy Siraisi (Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 1999), 205–47.

Encyclopedia Articles

- "Renaissance Humanism," in *Augustine through the Ages*, ed. Allan D. Fitzgerald, OSA (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 713–16.
- "Augustine of Hippo," in *Encyclopedia of the Renaissance*, ed. Paul Grendler, 6 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1999), I: 155–7.
- "Bessarion," I: 207–8.
- "Chrysoloras, Manuel," I: 448–50.
- "Cicero," I: 450–2.
- "Constantinople, Fall of," II: 74–5.
- "Gaza, Theodore," III: 21–2.
- "Gemistus Pletho, George," III: 23.
- "George of Trebizond," III: 38–9.
- "Greek Emigrés," III: 85–88.
- "Immortality," III: 254–6.
- "Lascaris, Constantine," III: 381–2.
- "Lascaris, Janus," III: 382.
- "Paul Oskar Kristeller," V: 302–4.
- "Remigio Sabbadini," V: 301–2.
- "Vatican Library," VI: 217–9.

Review

- Erasmus of Rotterdam, *Patristic Scholarship: The Edition of St Jerome*, ed., tr., and annot. James F. Brady and John C. Olin, in *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 61 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), in *Moreana* 36, 139–40 (1999): 149–52.

Obituary

- "Paul Oskar Kristeller (5 May 1905–7 June 1999), variant versions in *The Independent. The Weekend Review* (24 July 1999): 7; *Renaissance News & Notes* 11, 2 (Fall 1999): 4–5; *American Cusanus Society Newsletter* 16, 1 (July 1999): 8–10.

2000

Articles

“The Theology of Lorenzo Valla,” in *Humanism and Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Jill Kraye and M.W.F. Stone (London: Routledge, 2000), 1–23.

“Greek and Latin Learning in Theodore Gaza’s *Antirrheticon*,” in *Renaissance Readings of the Corpus Aristotelicum*, ed. Marianne Pade (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2000), 61–78.

“Toward the Genesis of the Kristeller Thesis of Renaissance Humanism: Four Bibliographical Notes,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 53 (2000): 1156–73.

Review

Iacopo Ammannati Piccolomini, *Lettere (1444–1479)*, ed. Paolo Cherubini, 3 vols. (Rome: Ministero per i Beni Culturali, 1997), in *The Catholic Historical Review* 105 (2000): 503–04.

2001

Article

“Disputationes Vallianae,” in *Penser entre les lignes: Philologie et Philosophie au Quattrocento*, ed. Fosca Mariani Zini (Lille: Presses Universitaires de Septentrion, 2001), 229–50.

Reviews

Librorum Graecorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae Index a Nicolao de Maiorani compositus et Fausto Saboeo collatus anno 1553, ed., intro., comm. Mervin R. Dilts, Mark L. Sosower, and Antonio Manfredi (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1998), in *Speculum* 76 (2001): 152–53.

Michael J.B. Allen, *Synoptic Art: Marsilio Ficino on the History of Platonic Interpretation* (Florence: Olschki, 1998), in *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* 37 (2001): 91–92.

Obituary

“Paul Oskar Kristeller,” in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 145, 2 (June 2001): 207–11.

“Paul Oskar Kristeller,” in *Gnomon. Kritische Zeitschrift für die gesamte klassische Altertumswissenschaft* 73, 4 (2001): 378–84.

2002

Articles

- “Theodore Gaza as a Philosopher: A Preliminary Survey,” in *Manuele Crisolora e il ritorno del greco in Occidente. Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Napoli, 26–29 giugno 1997)*, ed. Riccardo Maisano and Antonio Rollo (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 2002), 269–81.
- “Nicholas of Cusa, the Byzantines, and the Greek Language,” in *Nicolaus Cusanus zwischen Deutschland und Italien. Beiträge eines deutsch-italienischen Symposions in der Villa Vigoni vom 28.3.–1.4.2001*, ed. Martin Thurner (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002), 215–52.
- “Greek Renaissance Migrations,” *Italian History and Culture* (2002): 1–14.
- “Marsilio Ficino and the Plato-Aristotle Controversy,” in *Marsilio Ficino: His Theology, His Philosophy, His Legacy*, ed. Michael J. Allen and Valerie Rees (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 179–202.
- “Scienza e religione,” in *Storia della scienza*, ed. Sandro Petruccioli, 4 vols. (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2001 [*recte*, 2002]), 684–91. Online at http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/il-rinascimento-scienza-e-religione_%28Storia-della-Scienza%29/.

2003

Reviews

- Lauro Martines, *Strong Words: Writing and Social Strain in the Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), in *American Historical Review* 108 (2003): 279–80.
- Remo L. Guidi, *Il dibattito sull'uomo nel Quattrocento: Indagini e dibattiti* (Rome: Tielle Media, 1999), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 56 (2003): 762–64.
- The Correspondence of Roland H. Bainton and Delio Cantimori 1932–1966: An Enduring Transatlantic Friendship between Two Historians of Religious Toleration*, ed. John A. Tedeschi (Florence: Olschki, 2002), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 56 (2003): 814–16.
- Alessandro Daneloni, *Poliziano e il testo dell' Institutio Oratoria* (Messina: Università degli Studi di Messina, 2001), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 56 (2003): 1160–62.
- Maria Esposito Frank, *Le insidie dell'allegoria: Ermolao Barbaro il Vecchio e la lezione degli antichi* (Venice: Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti, 1999), in *Quaderni d'italianistica* 24 (2003): 138–39.

2004

Book

Greeks and Latins in Fifteenth-Century Italy: Renaissance Philosophy and Humanism (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2004). Pp. xii + 334.

Articles

"The Puzzling Dates of Paolo Cortesi," in *Humanistica per Cesare Vasoli*, ed. Fabrizio Meroi and Elisabetta Scapparone (Florence: Olschki, 2004), 87–97.

"Renaissance Ciceronianism and Christianity," in *Humanisme et église en Italie et en France méridionale (xv^e siècle–milieu du xvi^e siècle)*, ed. Patrick Gilli. Collection de l'École française de Rome, 330 (Rome: École française de Rome, 2004), 361–79.

Reviews

Humanist Educational Treatises, ed., tr., and intro. Craig Kallendorf. I Tatti Renaissance Library 5 (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 57 (2004): 970–71.

Jorge Ameruzes de Trebisonda, *El diálogo de la fe con el sultán de los turcos*, ed. and tr. Oscar de la Cruz Palma (Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, 2000), in *Speculum* 79 (2004): 1024–25.

Il Platone latino. Il Parmenide, ed. Ilario Ruoco (Florence: Olschki, 2003), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 57 (2004): 1360–62.

2005

Book

Nicolaus Scutellius, OSA, *As Pseudo-Pletho. The Sixteenth-Century Treatise Pletho In Aristotelem and The Scribe Michael Martinus Stella*. Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento. Quaderni di *Rinascimento*, 40 (Florence: Olschki, 2005). Pp. x + 181.

Articles

"Umanesimo italiano e cultura europea" in *Il Rinascimento italiano e l'Europa*, vol. 1, *Storia e storiografia*, ed. Marcello Fantoni (Vincenza: Fondazione Cassamarca – Angelo Colla Editore, 2005), 49–70.

"Niccolò Perotti's Date of Birth and His Preface to *De Generibus Metrorum*," *Bruniana & Campanelliana: Ricerche filosofiche e materiali storico-testuali* 11, 1 (2005): 118–21.

2006

Edited Book

Kristeller Reconsidered: Essays on His Life and Scholarship (New York: Italica Press, 2006). Pp. xviii + 310.

Articles

“Manuscripts,” in *Kristeller Reconsidered*, ed. John Monfasani (New York: Italica Press, 2006), 183–211.

“The ‘Lost’ Final Part of George Amiroutzes’ *Dialogus de Fide in Christum* and Zanobi Acciaiuoli,” in *Humanism and Creativity in the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honor of Ronald G. Witt*, ed. Christopher S. Celenza and Kenneth Gouwens (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 197–229.

“Pletho’s Date of Death and the Burning of His *Laws*,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 98 (2006): 93–97.

“The Renaissance as the Concluding Phase of the Middle Ages,” *Bullettino dell’Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo*, 108 (2006): 165–85. Reprinted in Hungarian translation by Nóra Dobozy as “A reneszánsz mint a középkor betetőző szakasza,” in *Helikon: Irodalomtudományi Szemle*, 2009/1–2: 183–200.

“Angelo Poliziano, Aldo Manuzio, Theodore Gaza, George of Trebizond and Chapter 90 of the *Miscellaneorum Centuria Prima* (With an Edition and Translation),” in *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism*, ed. Angelo Mazzocco (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 243–65.

“The Many Lives of Paul Oskar Kristeller,” in *Living Legacies at Columbia*, ed. William Theodore de Bary, ed., with Jerry Kisslinger and Tom Mathewson (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 107–15.

“George of Trebizond’s Critique of Theodore Gaza’s Translation of the Aristotelian *Problemata*,” in *Aristotle’s Problemata in Different Times and Tongues*, ed. Pieter De Leemans and Michèle Goyens (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006), 275–94.

“The Augustinian Platonists,” in *Marsilio Ficino: fonti, testi, fortuna*, ed. Sebastiano Gentile and Stéphane Toussaint (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 2006), 317–39.

“Aristotle as the Scribe of Nature: The Frontispiece of Vat. Lat. 2094 and the Plato-Aristotle Controversy of the Fifteenth Century,” *The Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 69 (2006): 193–205.

Prefaces

Preface to *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius: Selected Letters of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pope Pius II)* ed., tr., intro., and comm. Thomas M. Izbicki, Gerald Christianson, and Philip Krey (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2006), 1X–X.

Preface “Paul Oskar Kristeller – A Life of Learning” to *Bibliographia Kristelleriana: A Bibliography of the Publications of Paul Oskar Kristeller, 1929–1999*, ed. Thomas Gilbhard. *Sussidi Eruditi*, 72 (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 2006), VII–XVII.

Review

Erasmus of Rotterdam, *Controversies: Responsio ad Epistolam Paraeneticam Alberti Pii, Apologia Adversus Rhapsodias Alberti Pii, Brevissima Scholia*, ed. Nelson H. Minnich, trans. Daniel Sheerin, annot. Nelson H. Minnich and Daniel Sheerin. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 84 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), in *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 26 (2006): 131–33.

2007

Article

“Giles of Viterbo as *Alter Orpheus*,” in *Forme del neoplatonismo: Dall’eredità ficiniana ai platonici di Cambridge. Atti del convegno (Firenze, 25–27 ottobre 2001)*, ed. Luisa Simonutti (Florence: Olschki, 2007), 97–115.

2008

Articles

“A Tale of Two Books: Bessarion’s *In Calumniatorem Platonis* and George of Trebizond’s *Comparatio Philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis*,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 22,1 (2008): 1–15.

“Catholic American Exchange,” in *Catholicism as Decadence*, ed. Marcello Fantoni and Chiara Continisio (= *Italian History & Culture*, 12), (Florence: Edizioni Polistampa, 2008), 57–65.

“Criticism of Biblical Humanists in Quattrocento Italy,” in *Biblical Humanism and Scholasticism in the Age of Erasmus*, ed. Erika Rummel (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 15–38.

“Some Quattrocento Translators of St. Basil the Great: Gaspare Zacchi, Episcopus Anonymus, Pietro Balbi, Athanasius Chalkeopoulos, and Cardinal Bessarion,” *Philanagnostes. Studi in onore di Marino Zorzi*, ed. Chryssa Maltezou, Peter Schreiner, and Margherita Losacco (*Biblioteca* 27) (Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia, 2008), 249–64.

Reviews

Remo Gudi, *L'inquietudine del Quattrocento* (Rome: Tielle Media, 2007), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 56 (2008): 495–96.

Christine Smith and Joseph F. Connor, *Building the Kingdom: Giannozzo Manetti on the Material and Spiritual Edifice* (Tempe AZ: MRTS, 2006), in *The Catholic Historical Review* 94 (2008): 819–20.

Giorgio Fedalto, *Simone Atumano: Monaco di Studio, arcivescovo latino di Tebe. Secolo XIV* (Brescia: Paideia, 2007), in *The Catholic Historical Review* 94 (2008): 812–14.

Georgius Trapezuntius, *Rhetoricum libri quinque*, ed. and intro. Luc Deitz (Hildesheim: Olms, 2006): *Seventeenth-Century News. Neo-Latin Newsletter*, 56, 3–4 (2008): 258–60.

Obituary

“Eugene F. Rice, Jr. (20 August 1924–4 August 2008),” *Renaissance News & Notes*, 25, 2 [sic] (Fall 2008), 1, 9–11 (with Alison Frazier, James Hankins, and Jill Kraye).

2009*Reviews*

The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy, ed. James Hankins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), in *The Journal of the History of Philosophy* 47 (2009): 138–39.

Matthias Corvinus, the King: Tradition and Renewal in the Hungarian Royal Court, 1458–1490 ed. Péter Farbaky et al. (Budapest: Budapest History Museum, 2008), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 57 (2009): 486–88.

Writing Relations: American Scholars in Italian Archives: Essays for Franca Petrucci Nardelli and Armando Petrucci, ed. Deanna M. Shemek and Michael W. Wyatt (Florence: Olschki, 2008), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 62 (2009): 967–68.

2010*Article*

“Marsilio Ficino and Eusebius of Caesaria’s *Praeparatio Evangelica*,” *Rinascimento* 49 (2010): 3–13.

Reviews

- Giuseppe L. Coluccia, *Basilio Bessarione: Lo spirito greco e l'Occidente* (Florence: Olshki, 2009) in *Renaissance Quarterly* 63 (2010): 892–94.
- Paul F. Grendler, *The University of Mantua, the Gonzaga & the Jesuits, 1584–1630* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), in *American Historical Review* 115 (2010): 913.
- Maria P. Kalatzi, *Hermonymos: A Study in Scribal, Literary and Teaching Activities in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries* (Athens: Cultural Foundation of the National Bank of Greece, 2009), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 63 (2010): 1256–57.

Encyclopedia Article

- “Isagoge,” in *The Classical Tradition*, ed. Anthony Grafton, Glenn Most, and Salvatore Settis (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 488–89.

Obituary

- “Marion Leathers Kuntz (6 September 1924–10 July 2010),” in *Renaissance News & Notes*, 22, 2 (Fall 2010): 3.

2011

Book

- George Amiroutzes, *the Philosopher and His Tractates* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011). Pp. 220

Articles

- “Niccolò Perotti and Bessarion's *In Calumniatorem Platonis*,” in Niccolò Perotti: *the Languages of Humanism and Politics*, eds. Marianne Pade and Camilla Plesner Horster (= *Renaessancesforum. Tidsskrift for renaessancesforskning* 7 [2011]), 181–216.
- “Two Fifteenth-Century ‘Platonic Academies’: Bessarion's and Ficino's,” in *On Renaissance Academies: Proceedings of the international conference “From the Roman Academy to the Danish Academy in Rome. Dall'Accademia Romana all'Accademia di Danimarca a Roma.” The Danish Academy in Rome, 11–13 October 2006 I*, ed. Marianne Pade (= *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici. Supplementum* 42), (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 2011), 61–76.
- “The Pro-Latin Apologetics of the Greek Émigrés to Quattrocento Italy,” in *Byzantine Theology and its Philosophical Background*, ed. Antonio Rigo, with Pavel Ermilov and Michele Trizio (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 160–86.

Review

Paul Botley, *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396–1529. Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts* (Philadelphia, 2010), in *Renaissance Quarterly* 64 (2011): 163–64.

2012

Book

Bessarion Scholasticus: A Study of Cardinal Bessarion's Latin Library (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012). Pp. xiv + 306.

Articles

"Quality Control in Renaissance Translations: A Note of Pietro Balbi to Cardinal Oliviero Carafa," in *Roma e il Papato nel Medioevo. Studi in onore di Massimo Miglio*, ed. Anna Modigliani, vol. 11: *Primi e tardi umanesimi: uomini, immagini, testi* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2012), 129–40.

"Cardinal Bessarion's Greek and Latin Sources in the Plato-Aristotle Controversy of the 15th Century and Nicholas of Cusa's Relation to the Controversy," in *Knotenpunkt Byzanz: Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*, ed. Andreas Speer and Philipp Steinkrüger (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 485–511.

"The Greeks and Humanism" in *Humanism in Fifteenth-Century Europe*, ed. David Rundle (Oxford U.K.: Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature, 2012), 31–78.

"Bessarion's Own Translation of the *In Calumniatorem Platonis*," *Accademia: Revue de la Société Marsile Ficini* 14 (2012): 7–21.

"A Note on George Amiroutzes (c. 1400–1469) and His Moral Argument against the Transmigration of Souls," *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 54 (2012): 125–135.

"Erasmus and the Philosophers," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 32 (2012): 47–68.

"George Gemistus Pletho and the West: Greek Émigrés, Latin Scholasticism, and Renaissance Humanism," in *Renaissance Encounters: Greek East and Latin West*, ed. Marina S. Brownlee and Dimitri Gondicas (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 19–34.

Review

Stephen Greenblatt, *The Swerve: How the Renaissance Began* (London: Bodley Head, 2011), in *Reviews in History* <http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/1283>.

Republished as "Pretending to Write History," *La Parola del Passato: Rivista di Studi Antichi* 381 (2011): 468–474.

2013

Articles

“*Prisca Theologia* in the Plato-Aristotle Controversy,” in *The Rebirth of Platonic Theology: Proceedings of a conference held at The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies (Villa I Tatti) and the Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento (Florence, 26–27 April 2007)* For Michael J.B. Allen, ed. James Hankins and Fabrizio Meroi (Florence: Olschki, 2013), 47–59.

“The Pre- and Post-History of Cardinal Bessarion’s 1469 *In Calumniatorem Platonis*,” in “*Inter graecos latinissimus, inter latinos graecissimus*”: *Bessarion zwischen den Kulturen*, ed. Claudia Märkl, Christian Kaiser, and Thomas Ricklin (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 347–66.

Review

Ronald G. Witt, *The Two Latin Cultures and the Foundation of Renaissance Humanism in Medieval Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) in *Speculum* 88 (2013): 870–73.

2014

Article

“Giles of Viterbo and the Errors of Aristotle,” in *Egidio da Viterbo, cardinale agostiniano tra Roma e l’Europa del Rinascimento. Atti del Convegno (Viterbo, 22–23 settembre 2012–Roma, 26–28 settembre 2012)*, ed. Myriam Chiabò, Rocco Ronzani, and Angelo Maria Vitale (Rome: Centro Culturale Agostiniano-Roma nel Rinascimento [RR inedita 59, saggi], 2014), 162–82.

Preface

Preface, in *Johannes Bessario: La natura delibera; La natura e l’arte*, ed. and trans. Pier Davide Accendere and Ivanoe Privitera (Milan: Bompiani, 2014), 7–9.

PART 1

Notes



Byzantines at Rome in the Fifteenth Century

Concetta Bianca

In 1458, at the end of a thorough set of visitations to the Basilian monasteries of southern Italy, Atanasio Calceopulo drafted his *Liber visitationis*, and took pains to report with exactitude the declaration of the monk Ioachim of San Giovanni a Piro (Campania), going as far as to give the vernacular: *Stamu incappati in manu di questi Grechi, chi su venuti da lo Levante et non sapimu si su christiani oy turchi*.¹ The monk Ioachim was of course concerned about the fall of Constantinople, but may have been even more concerned about the increasing rigidity of the Basilian hierarchy. At the Rome meeting in 1446, the Chapter General of the Order of St Basil had imposed greater standardization of practice by issuing disciplinary statutes.² Thus, Ioachim's complaint about having "fallen into the hands of these Greeks" explicitly criticized Cardinal Bessarion, who had promoted the re-organization of the Order.³ Indeed, Bessarion had acquired exceptional authority within the papal curia – to such an extent that in 1462 Abbot Pietro Vitali, a Calabrian and an expert in Greek

-
- 1 Here is the full excerpt: "Die XXII marcii VI indictionis visitavimus monasterium Sancti Iohannis ad Pirum, quod tenet reverendissimus dominus cardinalis, in quo invenimus fratrem Cirillum, fratrem Bernardum, fratrem Dionisium, fratrem Andream et fratrem Ioachim: de quibus omnibus accepimus laudabilem famam et invenimus bene fecisse preter fratrem Ioachim, qui ausu themerario dixit malum de domino cardinali, dicendo: 'Questi Grechi non se sa si su christiani oy turchi, perché lo patriarcha de Constantinopoli non po' fare episcopi ne previteri, et non essendu previteri non potù baptizare et non potendu baptizare non ve po' essere nullu veru christianu'; et plus dixit: 'Stamu incappati in manu di questi Grechi, chi su venuti da lo Levante et non sapimu si su christiani oy turchi, chi ne facu andare sperti, et lo cardinale volce esser electu papa, poy gli cardinali dixerò: 'Volimu fare questu papa, chi non sapimu si è christianu,' et hoc testati fuerunt omnes supradicti fratres contra dictum fratrem Ioachim de causa sciencie; quem captivavimus, et postea liberavimus ipsum et misimus ipsum ad standum ad monasterium de Carra, et alios fratres confortavimus ad bene agendum. . . ." from *Le "Liber visitationis" d'Athanasios Chalkéopoulos (1457–58). Contribution à l'histoire du monachisme grec en Italie méridionale*, ed. Marie-Hyacinthe Laurent and André Guillou (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1960), 160–161.
 - 2 Raymond Loenertz, "Statuti disciplinari del capitolo generale della 'Religione di Santo Basilio' celebrato a Roma nel 1446," *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* n.s. 1 (1947): 179–84.
 - 3 See n. 1 above.

who had subscribed the Bull of Union (6 July 1439), had to yield leadership at the Abbey of Grottaferrata to the cardinal.⁴

It was not easy for a Byzantine to find a stable position for himself on Italian territory, and it was perhaps most difficult at Rome. The stereotypical image – that of Byzantines arriving in Italy with the Council of Ferrara-Florence and again with the fall of Constantinople to assume roles as teachers of Greek – was demolished some time ago by John Monfasani's research.⁵ Not all Byzantines arrived in Italy in connection with the Council or the fall of Constantinople; not all Byzantines taught Greek.⁶ To be accepted as teachers – Monfasani observed in 1989, discussing Theodore Gaza's teaching at Ferrara – the immigrants from Byzantium had, first, to know Latin; second, to be proficient rhetoricians and orators; and third, to gather supporters.⁷ Giovanni Argiropulo struggled to win the *studium* appointment in Florence in 1455: there was violence between his supporters and the party opposed to 'foreign' professors.⁸ Indeed, in 1471 Argiropulo would transfer to Rome with his family, perhaps

4 See Mario Mandalari, *Pietro Vitali e un documento inedito riguardante la storia di Roma (secolo xv)* (Rome: Fratelli Bocca Editore, 1887); *Acta Camerae Apostolicae et Civitatum Venetiarum, Ferrariae, Florentiae, Ianuae de Concilio Florentino*, ed. Georgius Hofmann (Rome: Pontificium Institutum orientalium studiorum, 1950), at 55.

5 One could point here to Monfasani's entire opera, but a watershed for the renewal of research on the byzantine emigrés was Monfasani's *George of Trebizond: A Biography and Study of His Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden: Brill, 1976). Redating letters, identifying annotating hands, discovering the owners of incunables: Monfasani's *scopertine* (as he called them, for instance in *George Amiroutzes: The Philosopher and His Tractates* [Leuven: Peeters, 2011], 1), overturned stereotyped historiographical constructions. Cf. Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966); id., "Italian Renaissance Thought and Learning and the Role of the Emigré Scholars in Florence, Rome, and Venice: A Reassessment," *Rivista di Studi bizantini e slavi* 3 (1983): 129–57; id., "Italian Humanism and Byzantine Emigrés," in *Renaissance Humanism. Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, ed. Albert Rabil, Jr., 3 vols. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), I, 350–81.

6 See the preceding note.

7 John Monfasani, "L'insegnamento universitario e la cultura bizantina in Italia nel Quattrocento" in *Sapere e/é potere. Discipline, dispute, e professioni nell'Università medievale e moderna. Il caso bolognese a confronto*, ed. Luisa Avellini (Bologna: Comune di Bologna-Istituto per la storia di Bologna, 1990), 43–65; repr. in John Monfasani, *Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and Other Emigrés. Selected Essays* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1995).

8 Armando F. Verde, "Giovanni Argiropulo e Lorenzo Bonincontri professori nello Studio fiorentino," *Rinascimento* s. 2, 14 (1974): 279–87. Jonathan Davies, *Florence and its University during the Early Renaissance* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 121.

mindful of the hostility that had greeted him in Florence, perhaps attracted to Rome's promise of a peaceful *domicilium sapientiae*.⁹ Constantino Lascaris, too, had a struggle to establish himself.¹⁰ He moved from one city to another before settling at Messina, the location of San Salvatore in Lingua Phari, one of the most important monasteries of the Basilian order. The city received him with the greatest honors, but had no *Studium* to ensure intellectual and financial support.¹¹

It was not easy, despite everything, for the Greeks to come to Rome. Innocent VII and Martin V had grasped the importance of gathering learned men of great reputation to teach at the *Studium Urbis*, and from this point of view the Byzantines who wanted to find their place in the city had *somehow* to pass the exam that would certify their learning.¹² But to be learned signified first of all the capacity to display the skills of oratory and Latin rhetoric. And on this front even George of Trebizond – who had advanced rhetorical studies so much when in 1434 he introduced Byzantine oratorical theories in his *Rhetorica*, and who had contributed so greatly during the difficult years of the Council by translating texts of vital importance for the debate between the Latin and Greek Churches – found himself roughly set aside, the influence of his contributions underestimated, or at least subject to harsh criticism driven by ideological and philosophical motives.¹³ Porcelio's declaration of esteem

- 9 Daniela Gionta, "Dallo scrittoio di Argiropulo: un nuovo paragrafo della fortuna dell'*Etica nicomachea* tra Quattro e Cinquecento," *Studi umanistici* 3 (1992): 7–57; Concetta Bianca, "La curia come 'domicilium sapientiae' e la 'sancta rusticitas,'" in *Humanisme et Église en Italie et en France méridionale (xv^e siècle–milieu du xvi^e siècle)*, ed. Patrick Gilli (Rome: École française de Rome, 2004), 97–113.
- 10 Massimo Ceresa, "Lascaris, Costantino," in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* LXIII (Rome: Treccani, 2004), 781–85.
- 11 See Concetta Bianca, *Stampa, cultura e società a Messina alla fine del Quattrocento*. 2 vols. (Palermo: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, 1988), 475–476; Guglielmo Bottari, "La problematica 'de viris illustribus' nel Quattrocento siciliano," *Quarto quaderno di filologia, lingua e letteratura italiana* (Verona: Università di Verona, 1992), 63–103.
- 12 Innocent VII's bull *Ad exaltationem romanae urbis* is edited and discussed by Gordon Griffiths, "Leonardo Bruni and the Restoration of the University of Rome," *Renaissance Quarterly* 26 (1973): 1–10, at 10. On Martin V, see Germano Gualdo, "Umanesimo e segretari apostolici all'inizio del Quattrocento. Alcuni casi esemplari," in *Cancellaria e cultura nel Medio Evo*, ed. Germano Gualdo (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1990), 307–18; repr. in id., *Diplomatica pontificia e umanesimo curiale. Con altri saggi sull'Archivio Vaticano, tra medioevo ed età moderna*, ed. Rita Cosma (Rome: Herder, 2006), 391–405.
- 13 John Monfasani, "Humanism and Rhetoric," in *Renaissance Humanism*, 171–235; repr. in John Monfasani, *Language and Learning in Renaissance Italy. Selected Articles* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1994). For the translations see id., "Alexius Celadenus and Ottaviano Ubaldini: An

for George's knowledge of Latin was not sufficient to save the Greek scholar's reputation.¹⁴ With great bitterness, George's son Andrea of Trebizond would take up his father's defence, objecting that the printed edition of Bessarion's *In calumniatorem Platonis*, like all texts entrusted to the presses, only amplified polemics, nourished critics, and augmented ill-will.¹⁵ Theodore Gaza himself, who had been called to Rome by Nicholas V expressly to complete the translation of the entire Aristotelian corpus, was then cast off, as Francesco Filelfo pointed out maliciously.¹⁶

It was not easy for the Greeks to stay in Rome. If their presence was in any way useful, they were tolerated, but when they were dispensable, they found it easiest just to leave. Niccolò Sagundino had worked as a translator at the Council, and returned with the Curia to Rome, but he never found a stable position.¹⁷ Niccolò Sofiano was welcomed into Cusanus' circle, but after the cardinal's death he won no further appointments, unlike the Latins, who passed into the *familia* of other cardinals or entered curial service.¹⁸ It is true that Niccolò Sofiano witnessed a donation by Cardinal Bessarion (and so presumably was in the cardinal's household), but at the same time he was beset

epilogue to Bessarion's relationship with the court of Urbino," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 46 (1984): 698–754, with discussion in id., *George of Trebizond*, 102–109.

14 Monfasani, *George of Trebizond*, 54.

15 Andrea's letter to Paul II (*Contra Platonem ex Doctorum auctoritate*) in Francesco Antonio Zaccaria, *Iter litterarium per Italiam* (Venice: Sebastian Colet, 1762), 127–134.

16 On Theodore's situation, see Concetta Bianca, "Un messale 'ritrovato' del cardinale Bessarione," *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia* 44 (1999): 737–46, at 738; Luciana Repici, "Teodoro Gaza traduttore e interprete di Teofrasto: la recezione della botanica antica tra Quattro e Cinquecento," *Rinascimento* s. 2, 43 (2003): 417–505; Daniela Gionta, "Il codice di dedica del Teofrasto latino di Teodoro Gaza," *Studi medievali e umanistici* 2 (2004): 167–214. For Filelfo's comment, see Concetta Bianca, "'Auctoritas' e 'veritas': il Filelfo e le dispute tra platonici e aristotelici," in *Francesco Filelfo nel quinto centenario della morte* (Padua: Antenore, 1986), 207–47, at 236.

17 Concetta Bianca, *Da Bisanzio a Roma. Studi sul cardinale Bessarione* (Rome: Roma nel Rinascimento, 1999), 27.

18 On Sofiano, see Paul Oskar Kristeller, "A Latin Translation of Gemistos Plethon's 'De fato' by Johannes Sophianus dedicated to Nicholas of Cusa," in *Nicolò Cusano agli inizi del mondo moderno*. Atti del Congresso internazionale in occasione del V centenario della morte di Nicolò Cusano (Bressanone, 6–10 novembre 1964) (Florence: Sansoni, 1970), 175–93; repr. in id., *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, 111 (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1993), 21–38; Concetta Bianca, "La biblioteca romana di Niccolò Cusano," in *Scrittura, Biblioteche e Stampa a Roma nel Quattrocento*, ed. Massimo Miglio (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1983), 669–708, at 704.

by Porcelio's ferocious criticisms.¹⁹ The Greek copyists who were called to the city, often to transcribe codices – now for the pope, now for one cardinal or another – do not seem to have enjoyed a fixed abode and, although mobility was typical of professional copyists, seem to have stayed at Rome even less than others. For example, Giovanni Rhosos transcribed codices at Rome on commission from Bessarion (Venice, Bibl. Marciana, MS Gr. 384, completed 10 October 1456 and containing the Plutarch's *Vitae*; and Venice, Bibl. Marciana, MS Gr. 200, completed 15 July 1457 and containing the corpus of Aristotelian works);²⁰ from Theodore Gaza (Vienna, ÖNB, MS Gr. 64, finished on 24 March 1457) and from Gaspare Zacchi (Paris, BnF, MS Gr. 2524, completed 4 August 1457).²¹ Nonetheless, Rhosos retired to Grottaferrata and ended his days at Venice.²² Bessarion himself, although he had welcomed Andronico Callisto and Alessio Celadeno into his so-called academy, set aside no posts in his *familia* for fellow Greeks.²³ Callisto and Celadeno were perhaps the only two

-
- 19 Bessarion's act of donation, dated 13 August 1465, gave to the monastery of Grottaferrata a *pianeta* and an altarcloth as well as two *piviali* and a chalice with paten (these last two items reserved to Bessarion's lifetime use): see Bianca, "Un messale ritrovato," repr. in ead., *Da Bisanzio a Roma*, 151–57, at 152. For Porcelio's criticism, ead., "'Graeci', 'Graeculi', 'Quirites': A proposito di una contesa nella Roma di Pio 11," in *Filologia umanistica. Per Gianvito Resta*, eds. Vincenzo Fera and Giacomo Ferraù (Padua: Antenore, 1997), 141–63.
 - 20 On the Plutarch, see Mario Manfredini, "I manoscritti plutarchei del Bessarione," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, s. 3, 24 (1994): 31–48, at 32–36; on the commission, see Aubrey Diller, "Bessarione bibliofilo e filologo," *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* n.s. 5 (1968): 61–83, at 75–77. The manuscript is described by Paolo Eleuteri in *Bessarione e l'Umanesimo. Catalogo della mostra*, ed. Gianfranco Fiaccadori (Naples: Vivarium, 1994), at 443, entry number 60.
 - 21 For the Gaza commission, see Paolo Eleuteri's entry in *Bessarione e l'Umanesimo*, at 444, number 63; for the Zacchi, see Filippo Di Benedetto, "Il curioso inventario dei libri di Gaspare Zacchi da Volterra (1425–1474)," in *Miscellanea di studi in memoria di Anna Saitta Revignas* (Florence: Olschki, 1978), 181–206, at 183; Concetta Bianca, "I possessori," in Lorenzo Valla. *Orazione per l'inaugurazione dell'anno accademico 1455–1456*, ed. Silvia Rizzo (Rome: Roma nel Rinascimento, 1994), 151–74, at 151–56.
 - 22 Maria G. Fornaci, "Giovanni Rhosos e Grottaferrata," *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* n.s. 44 (1990 [1993]): 217–29.
 - 23 On Callisto, see *I lettori di retorica e 'humanae litterae' allo Studio di Bologna nei secoli xv–xvi*, ed. Loredana Chines (Bologna: Università degli studi, 1992), at 5–6; and most recently Antonio Rollo, "Interventi di Andronico Callisto in codici latini," *Studi medievali e umanistici* 4 (2006): 267–80. On Celadeno, see Monfasani, "Alexius Celadenus," with David Speranzi, "L'anonymus δ-καί, copista del Corpus aristotelicum. Un'ipotesi di identificazione," *Quaderni di storia* 69 (2009): 105–23; id., "Il ritratto dell'Anonimo. Ancora sui manoscritti di Alessio Celadeno, vescovo di Gallipoli e Molfetta," in *La tradizione dei testi*

exceptions: the first had been involved, certainly at Bessarion's request, in preparing the memorial collection to honor of Federico da Montefeltro's prematurely deceased wife, Battista Sforza; the second belonged to a noble family – as did Bessarion, according to recent discoveries by Tommaso Braccini.²⁴ This hypothesis can be confirmed with a glance at the list of the members of Bessarion's cardinalatial *familia* (dated 1 January 1472).²⁵ Of 83 members, only seven were Byzantines, namely, *Iacobus Seba de Cipro, clericus nicosiensis; Dimitrius Gelayti, presbiter malvasiensis diocesis; Alexius Keladenus, clericus spartanus; Georgius Bonagraoutis, clericus agenensis; Georgius de Nigrinis, clericus pergamensis diocesis; Franciscus de Nigrinis, clericus pergamensis diocesis*.²⁶ In confirmation of the fact that Greek nationality alone was no guarantee of success, note that *Franciscus de Nigrinis* – that is, Francesco Pescennio Greco – years later, in 1513, declared that he had studied with Domizio Calderini.²⁷ He had been formed, in other words, by a Latin who taught Greek.

Not the *natio graeca* but above all the *natio germanica* was the preferred resource for filling the position of *secretarius*.²⁸ Moreover, on another plane, when Bessarion organized a collection of letters he had received that would confirm the favorable reception of *In calumniatorem Platonis* (Venice, Bibl. Marciana, MS Marc. Lat. VI, 210 in the hand of the faithful secretary Niccolò Perotti), he included a single Greek among the six guarantors, so to speak: next to the letters of Filelfo, Leonicensio, Panormita, Naldi, and Ficino, appeared one by Argiropulo alone.²⁹

greci in Italia meridionale. Filagato da Cerami 'philosophos' e 'didaskalos'. Copisti, lettori, eruditi in Puglia tra XII et XVI secolo, ed. Nunzio Bianchi (Bari: Edipuglia, 2011), 113–124.

- 24 See Adolfo Cinquini, *Il codice vaticano-urbinate latino 193. Documenti ed appunti per la storia letteraria d'Italia nel Quattrocento*, 2 vols. (Aosta: Allasia, 1905–1909) on the memorial volume. On Bessarion's noble status, see Tommaso Braccini, "Bessarione commeno? La tradizione indiretta di una misconosciuta opera storica di Giano Lascaris come fonte biografico-genealogica," *Quaderni di storia* 64 (2006): 61–115.
- 25 Bianca, *Da Bisanzio a Roma*, 169–172 (App. IV: I 'familiari' del Bessarione); eadem, "L'ambiente romano dell'Accademia," in *Bessarione e la sua Accademia*, ed. Andrzej Gutkowski (Rome: Casa editrice Miscellanea Francescana, 2012), 57–63.
- 26 Bianca, *Da Bisanzio a Roma*, 170–72. Add to these *Luca de Neapoli, presbiter nigropontinus*.
- 27 Giovanni Mercati, *Ultimi contributi alla storia degli umanisti*, II, *Note sopra A. Bonfini, M.A. Sabellico, A. Sabino, Pescennio Francesco Negro, Pietro Summonte e altri* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1939), 38.
- 28 Michael Matheus, "Roma e Magonza. Università italiane e tedesche nel XV e all'inizio del XVI secolo," *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo* 108 (2006): 123–63.
- 29 Lotte Labowsky, "An Autograph of Niccolò Perotti in the Biblioteca Marciana," *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 6 (1968): 199–205; Karl August Neuhausen and Erich Trapp, "Lateinische Humanistenbriefe zu Bessarions Schrift, *In calumniatorem Platonis*,"

Indeed, it was at Rome during Pius II's pontificate – the years of the dispute between Dominicans and Franciscans *de sanguine Christi*, of the collections of cash for the *cassa pro crociata*, of the trials *contra fraticellos*, of the *enciclica ad graecos* with which Bessarion invited his fellow Greeks to respect the pacts of Union – that a polemic erupted about what role the teaching of Greek should play in the formation of young men, a question that by reflex extended also to what role the *graeci-graeculi* should have in society in general and in Rome – the city of the Quirites – in particular.³⁰ The bitter disagreement between Niccolò Della Valle, prominent translator of Hesiod and Homer, and an anonymous instructor who disdained to teach the Greek language (and thus also Greek culture), emerges from a long poem by Della Valle as not just a quarrel over didactic methods.³¹ The question was: given that the Latin language derived from the Greek, was it necessary to learn and study the Greek language? The instructor who thought it was not, has been tentatively identified as Porcelio Pandoni; in any event Porcelio attacked Martino Filetico – calling him *graeculus* because his syllabus left plenty of room for the study of Greek.³² Thus to privilege the learning of Latin, leaving aside Greek as Porcelio desired (Porcelio in this way transferred to Rome an earlier polemic with another translator from the Greek, Basinio da Parma), was not just a question of language, education, and learning.³³

After Bessarion's death and the dispersal of his *familia*, including its handful of Byzantines, the teaching of Greek as well as acknowledged expertise in the language became an appannage of the Latins, of such men as Giovanni Lorenzi, secretary of Cardinal Marco Barbo and interlocutor of Poliziano; Domizio Calderini, brilliant professor and repudiated teacher of that same Poliziano; Raffaele Maffei who, belonging to a curial family and firmly ensconced in the

Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik 28 (1979): 141–65; Bianca, *Da Bisanzio a Roma*, 38.

30 Bianca, “‘Graeci,’ ‘Graeculi.’”

31 See Mauro De Nichilo, “Della Valle, Niccolò,” in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* xxxvii (Rome: Treccani, 1989), 759–62. His attack on the instructor, entitled *Ad paedagogum graecis litteris detrahantem*, can be found in Vatican City, BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 1690, fols. 377r–388v (in the hand of Mariano de Magistris, on whom see Concetta Bianca, “Marianus de Magistris de Urbe” in *Scrittura, Biblioteche e Stampa*, 555–99); and in Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 8229, fols. 39–49.

32 Bianca, “‘Graeci,’ ‘Graeculi,’” 158.

33 On Porcelio's polemic with Basinio, see Feruccio Ferri, *Una contesa di tre umanisti: Basinio, Porcellio e Seneca. Contributo alla storia degli studi greci nel Quattrocento in Italia* (Pavia: Fusi, 1920), 45–61; Augusto Campana, “Basinio da Parma,” in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* vii (Rome: Treccani, 1965), 89–98.

Roman curia himself, pursued Greek studies in a way more antiquarian than philological; and the young Pietro Bembo, who lectured at Rome on Virgil.³⁴ A turning point was the plan to establish a Greek *collegium*, as Leo x wished, with a Greek printshop in annex.³⁵ This project recalled to Rome illustrious Byzantines who in other cities – starting with Florence and Venice – had consolidated their cultural presence and intellectual impact, men such as Marco Musuro, Zaccaria Calliergi, Giano Lascaris, and Arsenio Apostolis.³⁶ The

-
- 34 On Lorenzi, see Pio Paschini, *Il carteggio fra il card. Marco Barbo e Giovanni Lorenzi (148–1490)* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948), 69; Bianca, “I possessori,” 470; Massimo Ceresa, “Lorenzi, Giovanni,” in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* LXIII (Rome: Treccani, 2007): 13–16. On Calderini, see Maurizio Campanelli, *Polemiche e filologia ai primordi della stampa. Le ‘Observationes’ di Domizio Calderini* (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 2001), 9–10. On Maffei, see Pio Paschini, “Una famiglia di curiali: I Maffei di Volterra,” *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia* 7 (1953): 333–76; Carlo Dionisotti, *Gli umanisti e il volgare fra Quattro e Cinquecento* (Florence: Le Monnier 1968), at 48, repr. in Vincenzo Fera, ed. (Milan: Five Continents, 2003); Concetta Bianca, “Poliziano e la curia,” in *Agnolo Poliziano, poeta, scrittore, filologo*, eds. Vincenzo Fera and Mario Martelli (Florence: Le Lettere, 1998), 459–75, at 466–67. And on Bembo, Maurizio Campanelli, “Pietro Bembo, Roma e la filologia del tardo Quattrocento: per una lettura del dialogo ‘De Virgiliis Culice et Terentii fabulis,’” *Rinascimento* s. 2, 37 (1997): 283–319.
- 35 On the *collegium*, see Vittorio Fanelli, “Il Ginnasio greco di Leone x a Roma,” *Studi romani* 9 (1961): 379–93; repr. in Fanelli, *Ricerche su Angelo Colocci* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1979); Jean-Christophe Saladin, “Léon x philologue: le collègue des jeunes grecs du Quirinal (1514–1521),” *Quaderni di storia* 25 (2000): 157–88; Maurizio Campanelli and Agata Pincelli, “La lettura dei classici nello ‘Studium Urbis’ tra Umanesimo e Rinascimento,” in *Storia della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia de ‘La Sapienza’*, eds. Lidia Capo and Maria Rosa De Simone (Rome: Viella, 2000), 93–195, at 173. On the press, Francesco Barberi and Emidio Cerulli, “Le edizioni greche ‘in Gymnasio medico ad Caballinum montem,’” in *Atti del Convegno di studi su Angelo Colocci* (Jesi, 13–14 settembre 1969), ed. Vittorio Fanelli (Jesi: Amministrazione comunale, 1972), 61–76; Anthony Hobson, “The Printer of the Greek Editions ‘in Gymnasio ad Caballinum montem,’” in *Studi di biblioteconomia e storia del libro in onore di Francesco Barberi*, eds. Giorgio de Gregori and Maria Valenti (Rome: Associazione italiana biblioteche, 1976), 331–36; Konstantinos Staikos, *Charta of Greek Printing, 1, The Fifteenth Century* (Cologne: Dinter, 1998); Francesca Niuatta, “Libri greci a Venezia e a Roma,” in *Il libro italiano del Cinquecento: Produzione e consumo*. Catalogo della mostra (Rome: Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1989), 85–90; ead., “Prime fasi dell’editoria greca a Roma,” in *Editori ed edizioni a Roma nel Rinascimento*, ed. Paola Farenga (Rome: Roma nel Rinascimento, 2005), 77–89.
- 36 On Musuro, see Stefano Pagliaroli, “Nuovi autografi di Marco Musuro,” *Studi medievali e umanistici* 2 (2004): 356–63; Annaclara Cataldi Palau, “La vita di Marco Musuro,” *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 45 (2004): 295–639; David Speranzi, “Tra Creta e Firenze: Aristobulo Apostolis, Marco Musuro e il Ricardiano 77,” *Segno e testo* 4 (2006): 191–209;

project for the Greek college came to nothing, however. Perhaps its aim of bringing twelve young men from Greece to teach them Latin language and culture was unrealizable not so much for practical reasons as for ideological and religious ones. The cultural supremacy of the Latins, so well theorized by Lorenzo Valla, as well as the desire – whether just or not – of the Roman Church for supremacy over the Churches of the East (notwithstanding the various pacts of Union), impeded the firm rooting of Greeks in the City and in the Curia.³⁷ The cases of some noble immigrants – such as that of the queen of Cyprus – constituted an exception. Rome opened its arms to various *nationes*, but not to the Byzantines. At base, religious prejudice continued to take its toll. As the Basilian monk Ioachim declared, *non sapimu si sono christiani o turchi*.

On Calliergi, see Staikos, *Charta*, 391–433; Niutta, “Prime fasi,” 81–84, and Elpidio Mioni, “Calliergi, Zaccaria,” in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* xvi (Rome: Treccani, 1973): 611–13.

37 On Valla's theorization, see Mirko Tavoni, “On the Renaissance Idea that Latin Derives from Greek,” *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filosofia*, s. 3, 16, 1 (1985): 205–38.

Badgering for Books

Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini and Leonardo Bruni's Translation of Aristotle's Politics

Thomas Izbicki

Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, the Sienese humanist who reigned as Pope Pius II (1458–1464) has been called “the apostle of German humanism.”¹ This is, of course, an oversimplification. Italian humanism, like Italian jurisprudence,² crossed the Alps by many routes. One of these routes passed through Basel at the time of the church council that met there from 1431 until it moved to Lausanne in 1448. The role of the Council of Basel as a book market is important for the diffusion not just of conciliarist books, with their challenge to papal sovereignty, but for the copying and distribution of legal and literary texts.³ Aeneas was present in Basel for an extended period, serving the council and its pope, Felix V, as a secretary, before entering the service of Frederick III, the Hapsburg king of the Romans. While in Basel, he developed ties to prelates and men of letters, some of whom remained his correspondents after he departed.⁴ When Aeneas joined the imperial chancery, he found himself in a much less congenial environment with few intellectual peers and uncomfortable living conditions. He complained about this at length in his letters. Some of these complaints found their way into his work *On the Miseries of Courtiers*.⁵

1 This sobriquet is attributed to Paul Joachimsohn in Morimichi Watanabe, “Humanism in the Tyrol: Aeneas Sylvius, Duke Sigismund, Gregor Heimberg,” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 4 (1974): 177–202; reprinted in Watanabe, *Concord and Reform: Nicholas of Cusa and Legal and Political Thought in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Thomas M. Izbicki and Gerald Christianson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 241–66.

2 On the reception of Italian legal manuscripts in the North, see (among others) Emanuele Casamassima, *Iter Germanicum, Codices operum Bartoli a Saxoferrato recensiti*, vol. 1 (Florence: Olschki, 1971).

3 Johannes Helmuth, “Kommunikation auf den spätmittelalterlichen Konzilien,” in *Die Bedeutung der Kommunikation für Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, ed. Hans Pohl (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1989), 116–72 at 154–67.

4 Rosamond Joscelyne Mitchell, *The Laurels and the Tiara* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1963), 65–91.

5 *Enee Silvii Piccolominei Epistolarium seculare: complectens De duobus amantibus, De naturis equorum, De curialium miseriis*, ed. Adrianus van Heck (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2007), 393–421 no. 166, *De curialium miseriis*. See also Keith Sidwell, “Aeneas Sylvius

In this context, Aeneas was at first less like an apostle than a voice crying in the wilderness. Only gradually would he and other men of letters bring the new learning of Italy to the North.⁶

Even if we do not take his complaints at face value, we can trace in Aeneas' letters a desire to secure books not easily available in Germany. His efforts to badger for books needs to be examined to determine how readily humanistic texts reached the lands north of the Alps in the 1440s. Our special focus will be Aeneas' effort to secure a copy of Leonardo Bruni's translation of Aristotle's *Politics*. Aeneas has left us a trail of letters that document his efforts to obtain books, especially the *Politics*, while he was employed in the imperial chancery.

Bruni's was not the first such translation of Aristotle's *Politics*. William of Moerbeke, a Dominican friar, had done one in the thirteenth century (ca. 1260).⁷ There was, however, a strong desire for a newer and more accurate Latin version. Some writers believe Bruni was asked in 1433 by Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, the uncle of King Henry VI of England, to undertake a new translation. Bruni's own dissatisfaction with the style and accuracy of Moerbeke's version certainly entered into his decision to undertake this labor. When the task was completed in 1437, however, it was dedicated to Eugenius IV, the reigning pope. Eugenius' copy was delivered via Flavio Biondo, another leading humanist, who was serving in the papal chancery at that time.⁸ (Vespasiano Bisticci attributed the change in dedication of the translation to Bruni's dissatisfaction with the response of John Tiptoft, earl of Worcester, to the gift of a copy. This is a confusion of the Duke of Gloucester with the earl.)⁹

Piccolomini's *De curialium miseriis* and Peter of Blois," in *Pius II 'El più expeditivo pontefice': Selected Studies on Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (1405–1464)*, ed. Zweder von Martels and Arjo Vanderjagt (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 87–106.

- 6 Johannes Helmuth, "Vestigia Aeneae imitari: Enea Silvio Piccolomini als 'Apostel' des Humanismus: Formen und Wege seiner Diffusion," in *Diffusion des Humanismus: Studien zur nationalen Geschichtsschreibung europäischer Humanisten*, ed. Johannes Helmuth, Ulrich Muhlack and Gerrit Walther (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2002), 99–141.
- 7 On this translation and its commentators, see James Blythe, *Ideal Government and the Mixed Constitution in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992). Aeneas later described Bruni's dissatisfaction with existing translation; see *Eneae Silvii Piccolominei . . . De viris illustribus*, ed. Adrianus van Heck (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1991), 34.
- 8 For English versions of Bruni's letters about the project and the preface to his translation, see *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni: Selected Texts*, ed. Gordon Griffiths, James Hankins and David Thompson (Binghamton NY: MRTS, 1987), 154–70. The preface criticizes both the accuracy of the Moerbeke translation and its style.
- 9 *Renaissance Princes, Popes, and Prelates; the Vespasiano Memoirs, Lives of Illustrious Men of the xvth Century*, tr. William George and Emily Waters (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 366–67.

Like all Bruni's translations from the Greek, including versions of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Economics*, it was made elegant, possibly at the expense of the word order of the original Greek. The Latin version also included Bruni's translation of Greek technical terms into his own vocabulary rather than 'bastardized Latin'. Thus William's term *politica*, rooted in the Greek *Politeia* (πολιτεία), was replaced by *respublica*.¹⁰ Nonetheless, Bartolomeo Facio, in his *De viris illustribus*, praised Bruni for rescuing the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the *Politics* and the *Economics* from the semi-barbarity of previous translations.¹¹

Thus when, in 1443, Aeneas began begging for a copy of this translation, it was a comparatively new book. It would achieve a vast popularity later, the number of surviving copies, manuscript and print, far outnumbering those of the Latin version of Plato's *Republic*. Although the Council of Basel was in session in this period, no copies of the *Politics* in Bruni's version are recorded as having been made for the council's leaders or its apologists.¹² Aristotle's authority might have been used to argue that the Church was a mixed polity or even an aristocratic one, not a monarchy ruled by the Roman pontiff alone.¹³ The council's apologists may have found such arguments too extreme. They preferred more traditional legal and theological texts as supports for their efforts to impose their will on the pope and, when he refused to obey their decrees, to depose him.¹⁴ This did not change when the council tried to depose Eugenius and replace him with Amadeus VIII, the retired duke of Savoy, who chose

-
- 10 For this criticism of Bruni, see Paul Botley, *Latin Translation in the Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannazzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 58–59. On Bruni's approach to technical terms, see Charles B. Schmitt, *Aristotle and the Renaissance* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 67–68.
 - 11 *Bartholomaei Facii de viris illustribus liber...*, ed. Laurentius Mehus (Florence: Giovannelli, 1745), 9–10 at 10, "Aristotelis Ethicorum, Politicorum, & Oeconomicorum libros denuo traduxit, ac latinos, cum prius semibarbari essent, reddidit."
 - 12 See James Hankins, "Humanism and the Origins of Modern Political Thought," in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, ed. Jill Kraye (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 118–41 at 124; Hankins, *Repertorium Brunianum*, vol. 1 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medioevo, 1997), 243–46.
 - 13 John Mair was reluctant to draw such conclusions in his critique of Cajetan's defense of Pope Julius II, attributing to "other" writers the idea that the Church had an aristocratic polity; see Francis Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church 1300–1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 128–29.
 - 14 On the legists' role in Basel's polemics, see Joseph Canning, *A History of Medieval Political Thought 300–1450* (London: Routledge, 1996), 182–184. For a more theological discussion, one that avoids the Ultramontane sympathies of many European scholars, see Giuseppe Alberigo, *Chiesa conciliare* (Brescia: Paideia, 1981), 256–340.

as his papal name Felix v. Aeneas would rue at a later date his involvement with the campaign to replace Eugenius with Felix, but even he did not cite Aristotle when defending the Council of Basel's action against a legitimately elected Roman pontiff when representing the assembly before the princes of the Empire.¹⁵

Aeneas already knew Bruni's reputation when he left the employ of Felix v and joined Frederick III's chancery in 1442. His description of the city of Basel, written in 1434 while in Milan, away from the council, and addressed to Cardinal Cesarini, listed eminent Greek and Latin writers the ancestors had read, especially Plato and Aristotle. Next he listed eminent authors of his own day. Bruni's name leads this short list, followed by Ambrogio Traversari and Guarino da Verona. To these few he had added Cardinal Cesarini, who was the leading figure in the Council of Basel during its early years. Piccolomini described the cardinal, who later left Basel and became a supporter of Eugenius IV against the council, as consulted like the Delphic oracle by participants in the council.¹⁶

During his period in the imperial chancery, Aeneas recommended in 1443 that the youthful Sigismund of Tyrol, a minor in the keeping of his kinsman King Frederick, read eminent writers, past and present. Bruni, Guarino, Poggio Bracciolini, Giovanni Aurispa and Antonio Loschi were the moderns he praised for their eloquence, making passing reference to the many others living in Italy in his own day.¹⁷ Among the ancients, Aeneas recommended several works. One was Aristotle's *Politics* in Bruni's translation without his being able to provide a copy to King Frederick's young ward. Piccolomini condemned the old translation by William of Moerbeke for vitiating eloquence and troubling the intellect.¹⁸ During the next year, Piccolomini wrote to Wilhemus de Lapide defending the study of letters against the more lucrative disciplines of law and medicine. Aeneas argued that Germany, like Italy,

15 On Aeneas' changing assessment of Amadeus VIII, see Thomas M. Izbicki, "The Missing Antipope: The Rejection of Felix v and the Council of Basel in the Writings of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini and the Piccolomini Library," *Viator* 41 (2010): 301–314.

16 *Enee Silvii Piccolominei Epistolarium seculare*, 36 no. 16. On Cesarini's role at the Council of Basel, see Gerald Christianson, *Cesarini, the Conciliar Cardinal: the Basel Years, 1431–1438* (Sankt-Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1979).

17 *Enee Silvii Piccolominei Epistolarium seculare*, 204, no. 99, comparing his own day to the time of Augustus.

18 *Enee Silvii Piccolominei Epistolarium seculare*, 210 no. 99, "legendi erunt tibi *Politicorum* libri, quos Aristoteles composuit et Leonardus Aretinus latinus fecit. Ueterem autem translationem tibi nequaquam assumes, quia et eloquentiam uitiat et intellectum nimis uexat."

could be a seedbed of eloquence. The Italians he praised as examples to imitate were Bruni, Guarino, Poggio, Aurispa, Antonio Beccadelli (Panormita) and Loschi.¹⁹ He said that no one ever could give William gold that was of value comparable to what Quintilian had given to the Aretine, Leonardo Bruni, by improving his eloquence.²⁰ Clearly Aeneas respected Bruni as man of letters and translator. Small wonder, as a rising man of affairs, he thought he wanted to read the *Politics* in a well-regarded translation. With his eye on the politics of the Empire, Piccolomini went on to complain that the German princes paid attention to trifles but gave no thought to poetry, but he predicted a rich harvest could be reaped in Germany if letters were cultivated. This included the ability to reconcile one king with another, and cities could reach agreements with one another.²¹

Aeneas has left a trail of letters documenting his efforts to obtain the *Politics*, but this was not his first time asking friends far away to help him acquire a desirable book. In one earlier case, Aeneas wanted a copy of the commentary by Antonio Loschi, a humanist of an older generation, on eleven orations of Cicero. Having served as a conciliar secretary at the Council of Basel, Aeneas turned to a former colleague in the council, Francesco de Fusce, a Franciscan who had been made a cardinal by Felix v. During this period of his employment in the imperial chancery, Aeneas continued cultivating friends in Basel for some years, not just from a longing to hear tidings from afar but to hedge his political bets should the Council of Basel prevail over Pope Eugenius. In his letter (Wolkan I no. 62)²² broaching the matter of Loschi's commentary, the Sienese humanist did not hesitate to ask for it as a gift. He quoted Cicero himself [*Familiares* 5.12.1] to the effect that a book has no shame, then went on to say that he would receive the volume as a token of the mutual love and friendship between Francesco de Fusce and himself. He concluded by offering to do whatever he could in the future to aid the conciliar cardinal. In fact, Aeneas' gratitude to the cardinal for the copy of Loschi's work – and to the Council of Basel – was short lived.

19 *Enee Silvii Piccolominei Epistolarium seculare*, 288 no. 144.

20 *Enee Silvii Piccolominei Epistolarium seculare*, 288 no. 144, "nec tibi unquam tantum auri speculator prebuilt, quantum Quintilianus Aretino tribuit."

21 *Enee Silvii Piccolominei Epistolarium seculare*, 288–89 no. 144.

22 References to Latin texts of these letters come from *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*, ed. Rudolf Wolkan, vols. I–II (Vienna: Hölder, 1909 and 1912) unless otherwise noted. The translations in the text are mine, including any revised versions of texts in *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius: Selected Letters of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pope Pius II)*, ed. and tr. Thomas M. Izbicki, Gerald Christianson and Philip D. Krey (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2006), 152–53 no. 26.

Even as Aeneas was cultivating his ties back in Basel, he was reopening even older channels of communication with friends in the service of the pope. Both Piero da Noceto, with whom he had served in Domenico Capranica's household, and Giovanni Campisio had become papal secretaries.²³ Although the former was slow to renew his friendship with Aeneas, the latter, who had seen Aeneas while on a diplomatic mission to Vienna, was more approachable. So it was to Campisio that Aeneas turned when he decided that he needed Bruni's translation of the *Politics*. Along with a steady stream of news, not just of the Basel schism but of the politics of Central Europe and the ill-fated Crusade of Varna (1444), the humanist's letters to Campisio included repeated requests that the desired book be procured for him at a reasonable cost.

The matter of price should not be ignored when we review the letters themselves. Aeneas was at first, despite the title of poet laureate conferred on him by Frederick III in 1443, a minor member of the chancery. Nor was the king himself, atop being cautious and deliberate, either long in the pocket or interested in cultural pursuits.²⁴ Thus, when Aeneas decided that he needed a Bible to support his new-found desire to be ordained a priest, Aeneas wrote to Johann Tuschek, a friend in Prague, hoping to find a copy at a low price (Wolkan I no. 159).²⁵ Moreover, when the Bible came, the recipient was quick to proclaim his gratitude, saying what a bargain the book was. Piccolomini went on to relate his unsuccessful effort to persuade Frederick III to take an unstated course of action favored by Tuschek, suggesting that petitioning the king was the price of the book buying effort in Prague (Wolkan I no. 194).²⁶

Aeneas' documented pursuit of Bruni's version of the *Politics* began in October of 1443, just after he had obtained Loschi's commentary. He began his letter (Wolkan I no. 85)²⁷ by congratulating Campisio on his finding a copy of

23 For Piero da Noceto, who would be a principal secretary to Pope Nicholas V, see Peter Partner, *The Pope's Men* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 242–43, and Germano Gualdo, *Diplomatica pontificia e umanesimo curiale: con altri saggi sull'Archivio vaticano, tra Medioevo ed età moderna* (Rome: Herder, 2005), 435–49. Campisio served Giovanni Berardi, archbishop of Taranto and later a cardinal, and then served as bishop of Piacenza from 1453 to his death in 1475; see Pius B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae...* (Regensburg: Hiersemann, 1873–1886; Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1957), 746.

24 Joachim Stieber, *Pope Eugenius IV, the Council of Basel and the Secular and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Empire* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 208–10, 440–42.

25 *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius*, 204–05 no. 52.

26 *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius*, 228–29 no. 60.

27 *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius*, 167–69 no. 34. There is evidence in a later letter (Wolkan I no. 126) that Aeneas was following up on a conversation with Campisio, who had visited

the book, a copy that he did not mention again. (This copy, which is not mentioned again, may have been defective.) Then he offered to 'co-purchase's it, at a lower price, paying his share in gold. No offer was made to pay in advance; but delivery via Milan or through Johannes Tolner, a German jurist and copyist representing Frederick III at the Roman curia, was suggested.²⁸ Aeneas had written directly to Tolner on business in the winter of 1443–1444. In that letter he had urged the German jurist to advance the cause of Frederick III's candidate for the see of Brixen in curial circles. He did not, however, ask Tolner about obtaining the *Politics*. The fact they were both engaged in King Frederick's affairs might, however, have suggested to Aeneas the jurist's availability as an agent for sending the desired text to Germany.²⁹ Tolner's scribal role, copying manuscripts when not engaged in other business, might have made him seem like a good choice to transcribe the *Politics*; but Aeneas' letters show no awareness of the jurist's scribal labors. Campisio replied to Aeneas' letter (Wolkan I no. 95), offering to send the book any way his friend desired and protesting that money was not his chief concern. He did express a desire that Aeneas receive the best copy possible – once he and Tolner had found one.

In February of 1444 Aeneas wrote inquiring whether a letter to Campisio written a month before had arrived. In this letter (Wolkan I no. 117) he quoted Aristotle on human happiness not being only in the hand of fortune before recounting news of the crusade against the Turks being led by Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini and the king of Poland. Following up on that letter, Aeneas (Wolkan I no. 126)³⁰ expressed once more his eagerness to have Bruni's Aristotle translation, before he settled down to the business of promoting the interests of Kaspar Schlick, Frederick III's vice-chancellor, and his brother Heinrich, the imperial nominee to the see of Freising. Campisio replied in April of that year (Wolkan I no. 134) complaining how much harder it was to buy books in Rome than it had been when the Roman curia had resided in Florence. He reported, nonetheless, hiring a scribe to copy it quickly but well. Of the possible

Vienna in the entourage of Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini; see *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius*, 186 no. 42.

28 Frederick III was shifting in this period from neutrality to support of Eugenius IV; see Stieber, *Pope Eugenius IV*, 259–76. On Tolner, see Robert Gramsch, *Erfurter Juristen im Spätmittelalter: Die Karrieremuster und Tätigkeitsfelder einer gelehrten Elite des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 372–73, 375–78, 484. For manuscripts he copied, see Saint Benoit de Port Valais, *Colophons de manuscrits occidentaux des origines au XVI^e siècle*, vol. 3 (Fribourg Suisse: Editions universitaires, 1973), 522 nos. 11659–11633. Most of these manuscripts were copied in Florence between 1440 and 1442.

29 *Enee Silvii Piccolomini Epistolarium seculare*, 238–39 no. 109.

30 *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius*, 186–87 no. 42.

intermediaries in delivery of the book, Campisio named Tolner as the best choice. In an addendum, Campisio reported the death of Bruni and (erroneously) the naming of Poggio Bracciolini to his office as chancellor of Florence. Later, in the *Europa*, Piccolomini praised the Florentine commune for employing learned men as chancellor. He listed Bruni, Carlo Marsuppini and Poggio in correct order as holders of that office.³¹ In a letter from June of the year 1444 (Wolkan I no. 150), Aeneas expressed confidence that he would have the book soon. Campisio, he knew, had found a copyist; and he hoped Johannes Tolner would deliver it to him at Frederick's court as soon as it was ready. Piccolomini expressed his continuing eagerness to have Bruni's translation. Replying to the news of the translator's death, Aeneas commented: "May the living give to his shade a light covering of earth, and may eternal spring put crocuses in the urn, he who ornamented Latium with letters, than whom no one after Lactantius was nearer to Cicero."³²

By November, however, nothing had reached Aeneas. He told Campisio (Wolkan I no. 164)³³ to send the book with the king's messenger who would be returning from Rome. By 1445, his patience was wearing thin. He complained, among other things, (Wolkan I no. 185): "You have given me no reply about Aristotle's *Politics*." He went on, in a less than friendly tone: "I do not know whether you think me deceived."³⁴ Whether this complaint finally prodded Campisio and Tolner into action is uncertain. What we do know is that, by the end of 1445, Aeneas finally had the book that he desired; but he complained (Wolkan I no. 198) that the book was complete only through book eighth and asked for the rest of the text.

In a letter from January of the next year (Wolkan II no. 2), after expressing regret to Campisio that Gerardo Landriani, Cardinal of Como, had died, Aeneas went on to mention again the defect in the copy he had received, its incompleteness. He added: "If you have not received the letter, I will write again."³⁵

31 *Enee Silvii Piccolominei postea Pii PP. II De Europa*, ed. Adrianus Van Heck (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2001), 221. Aeneas also mentioned the role of Coluccio Salutati in the Florentine struggle with the Visconti of Milan.

32 *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius*, 203, no. 51. Aeneas had the line of succession of Florentine chancellors right in his *Europa*, listing Carlo Marsuppini between Bruni and Poggio; see *Enee Silvii Piccolominei... De Europa*, ed. Adrianus van Heck (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2001), 221. See also *De viris illustribus*, 37.

33 *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius*, 207–208 no. 54.

34 *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius*, 227 no. 59.

35 *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius*, 230 no. 61. We cannot determine whether this defect ever was remedied. The *Politics* is not among the known Piccolomini manuscripts

Aeneas then attacked George of Trebizond,³⁶ who, when translating Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, apparently had included an anachronistic mention of Cicero. This led into a statement on how a translation should be done: "For translations should be made word by word; or, if sentences are translated, the work must be done so that they should seem to be word for word." He concluded archly that no Cicero could have been cited by Aristotle unless someone of that name had lived before or in the Philosopher's time.

Ironically, when Aeneas wrote his 1446 *De ortu et auctoritate Romani imperii*, dedicated to Frederick III (Wolkan II no. 3), his new copy of Aristotle's *Politics* was not an essential resource. Aristotle's *Politics* and *Nicomachean Ethics* are cited briefly, but Cicero is the predominant influence.³⁷ Aristotle's *Ethics* in Bruni's version already had featured prominently among the texts Piccolomini cited in his *Pentalogus* (1443), which discussed, among other things, the possibility of Frederick III's going into Italy to be crowned emperor in Rome. Piccolomini later cited a discussion of Plato, including his compatibility with Christianity, found in Bruni's preface to the translation of the *Politics*, when he was working on a *Somnium* concerned with defeating the Turkish threat (ca. 1453).³⁸

This may seem like a lame ending to a long story. Aeneas' desire to have Bruni's translation was not matched by any extensive use of the text. Nonetheless, we are left with an intriguing question: Why was it so hard for Aeneas to secure the book? Clearly he was not affluent during the 1440s, but he was able to offer payment in gold. Was the problem then one of supply? Apparently. Bruni looks to us like a sufficiently important author and translator for his works to have

containing Bruni's writings and translations; see *Repertorium Brunianum*, I, nos. 1815, 2362, 2540, 2868.

36 *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius*, 230 no. 61. John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 261–94; idem, *Collectanea Trapezuntiana: Texts, Documents, and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond* (Binghamton NY: MRTS, 1984), 698–701, showing that Piccolomini had noticed a reference to Cicero in the *scholia* to the text.

37 *Three Tracts on Empire: Engelbert of Admont, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini and Juan de Torquemada*, ed. Thomas M. Izbicki and Cary J. Nederman (Bristol: Thoemmes, 2000); Nederman, "Humanism and Empire: Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, Cicero and the Imperial Ideal," *The Historical Journal* 36 (1993): 499–515.

38 Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, *Pentalogus*, ed. Christoph Schingnitz (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2009), 21, 313–14, citing Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS I 115 sup.; idem, *Dialogo su un sogno*, tr. Alessandro Scafi (Raconigi: Aragno, 2004), 259; idem, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, *Dialogus*, ed. Duane R. Henderson (Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 27; Munich: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 2011). Aeneas left the *Somnium* incomplete for unknown reasons.

been desired by learned readers, and the surviving mass of manuscript evidence seems to confirm this. The question arises whether Italian humanistic material was all that available outside Florence and other centers of humanistic in Italy? Apparently it was not readily available in Rome during the period after Eugenius returned from his long exile in Bologna, Ferrara and Florence.³⁹ Availability of such texts beyond the Alps seems to have been even more limited. Consider, for instance, how Sigismund of Tyrol, the young acquaintance of Aeneas, got the humanist to write a model love letter for him to use in courtship (Wolkan I no. 104).⁴⁰ The duke was something of a book collector before political battles and extravagance brought him down, able to buy books from stationers in Augsburg; but these men may not have stocked the newest humanistic texts during the period of Aeneas' residence in Frederick III's chancery. They seem not to have stocked Bruni's version of the *Politics*, which Aeneas had recommended to the young prince.⁴¹ German students brought legal and other texts back from Italian university cities, but Bruni's translation of the *Politics* apparently was not among them.⁴² More curiously, Campisio complained how hard it was to find books in Rome, to which city the pope and his entourage had returned in 1443. The seat of Christendom apparently was not a prime market for new books of a humanistic bent, unlike Florence, a primary node for the diffusion of such works.⁴³ The later misfortunes of the German printers Schweinheim and Pannartz in Subiaco and Rome, where they nearly went broke printing fine books, tends to confirm this. In 1472 they petitioned the pope for relief, which earned them support in the form of benefices. Even so, they had to close up shop a year later.⁴⁴ Bruni may have sold well in Florence and to scholars influenced by Florentine humanism, but Aeneas' experience suggests that this was what we now call a niche market in the

39 For Eugenius' political misfortunes and long exile, see Joseph Gill, *Eugenius IV, Pope of Christian Union* (Westminster MD: Newman Press, 1961).

40 *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius*, 180–81 no. 38. The love letter was written as if from Hannibal, Duke of Numidia, to Lucretia, the daughter of the King of Epirus.

41 Watanabe, "Humanism in Tyrol," in *Concord and Reform*, 249.

42 Agostino Sottili, *Università e cultura: studi sui rapporti italo-tedeschi nell'età dell'Umanesimo* (Goldbach: Keip Verlag 1993).

43 Diffusion of manuscript works from particular nodal points is well documented, in the case of Jean Gerson, by Daniel Hobbins, *Authorship and Publicity before Print: Jean Gerson and the Transformation of Late Medieval Learning* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

44 Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, *The Coming of the Book*, tr. David Gerard (London: Verso, 1984), 168; Andrew Pettegree, *The Book in the Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 49–51.

earlier years of the fifteenth century. Ironically, the first printed version of Bruni's translation would be done in Strasbourg circa 1469, about 5 years after Pius II died:

[A]ristotelis ethicoru[m] libros Latinos facere nuper institui no[n] quia prius traducti non e[ss]ent [sed] quia sic t[ra]ducti era[n]t ut barbari magis[que] Lat[in]i eff[e]cti viderent[ur] (Strassburg: Johann Mentelin, before 10 Apr. 1469).⁴⁵

The Aretine's translation of the *Politics* would eventually oust William of Moerbeke's from learned circles across all of Europe. It would appear in editions of Aristotle's *opera omnia*, as well as in individual editions.⁴⁶ A competing translation of the *Politics* by Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda with his commentary, the *Enarratio in Aristotelis de republica*, was published in the sixteenth century; but it would not rival Bruni's translation in popularity.⁴⁷

45 See the entry in the *Incunabula Short Title Catalog* [<http://istc.bl.uk/>], accessed on May 25, 2012. Existence of this edition was first communicated to the author by James Hankins on February 5, 2008. See fol. [197r–198v], “Libros politicorum multis a me vigiliis.” [198v–199r] “Magnifici et potentes domini domini mei singularissimi post recommendationem. Non sum oblitus cuius sum vere devotus. Florencie 8 Kal. decembris anno domini 1438. [fol. 199r v] Spectabilis ac clarissime vir. Accepimus summo cum gaudio prom(p)tissimos habiturum. Datam Senis die vicesima octaua decembris.”

46 For example, Bruni's translations of the *Ethics*, *Politics* and *Economics* appear in Aristotle, *Opera*, 5 vols. (Venice: Bernardinus Stagninus, 1489).

47 Schmitt, *Aristotle and the Renaissance*, 72, 140; Charles Lohr, “Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 30 (1977): 697. On Sepúlveda's use of Aristotle in his debate with Bartolomé de las Casas, see Lewis Hanke, *Aristotle and the American Indians: A Study in Race Prejudice in the Modern World* (Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 1959).

Heralds of Antiquity

Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini and the British “Thucydides”

David Rundle

Humanists travelled, albeit often grudgingly. They had better reason to complain of the discomforts and dangers of international trips than we who sit in economy class. For them, a journey could all too often be positively life-threatening. All the same, for many, simply staying at home was rarely an option; the pursuit of a career and of fortune made them frequent voyagers. I have elsewhere discussed several of the uses of ‘beyond Italy’ to the Italian humanists, which undercut the rhetoric of disdain toward foreigners they sometimes paraded. They themselves would usually admit only to one such use: that their foreign sojourns allowed them to recover and release from captivity classical texts previously unavailable to civilization – that is to say, unavailable to their own coteries.¹ The pursuit of archival archaeology was an activity central to the agenda of the *studia humanitatis*, written up in their own accounts as heroic tales of the humanist hunter-gatherer, enduring the privations of travel to distant climes in order to track down their quarry that would provide intellectual nourishment to sate even the most voracious learned appetite.

The following brief intervention unpacks one such incident in the heroic history of humanist archival archaeology. I say an incident but, as we shall see, it was, in truth, a feigned event, a myth rather than a moment and, in every sense, a pious fraud. The tale’s hero (if such he can be called in this context) was Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, whose own career as a manuscript hunter-gatherer is said to have taken place over two decades before he became pope and when he was merely secretary to Cardinal Niccolò Albergati. Piccolomini was in the cardinal’s entourage when, in the summer of 1435, Albergati presided at the Congress of Arras, the international conference which was to see England’s chances of a durable victory in France dealt a death-blow by the end of the Burgundian alliance.² In those same months, Piccolomini was despatched to

1 David Rundle, “From Greenwich to Verona: Antonio Beccaria, St Athanasius and the Translation of Orthodoxy,” *Humanistica* 5 (2010): 109–119.

2 I discuss the cultural activities at Arras in my soon-to-be-complete *England and the Identity of Italian Renaissance Humanism*. See also Jocelyn G. Dickenson, *The Congress of Arras 1435: A Study in Medieval Diplomacy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955); Friedrich Schneider, *Der*

Britain. It was a journey of which he could summon up vivid memories twenty years later when, as Pius II, he composed his *Commentarii*.³ And well might he remember it, not least because it gave him lasting proof of the travails of travel.

The mission with which he had been entrusted was to take him to the Stewart court in Scotland, but his first attempt to reach there was thwarted by the English refusal to give him safe conduct. At least this abortive trip, Pius later recalled, allowed him *populosas ditissimasque Lundonias vidit et Sancti Pauli nobile templum*, as well as the tomb of the English martyr, Thomas Becket, in Canterbury.⁴ Having had to return to the continent, he set out again by ship, this time with the intention of sailing directly to Scotland. During the journey, though, such a storm arose that Piccolomini feared for his life and believed his best recourse was to beg the Virgin for assistance; he sent his prayers with a promise that, if she saved him, he would, on landing, walk barefoot to the first church dedicated in her honour. Who of us is fit to fathom the ineffable kindness of the Blessed Virgin in granting his wish and letting him keep his promise? He must have landed near Dunbar and he himself says he walked ten miles, to Whitekirk, an established site of pilgrimage where a new hostel had recently been built.⁵ And this was at a time of the year when Scotland is not

Europäische Friedenskongress von Arras (1435) und die Friedenspolitik Papst Eugens IV. und des Basler Konzils (Greiz: Verlag Henning, 1919), and, in particular, Claudia Märkl, "Tommaso Parentucelli, Pietro da Nocento, Petrus de Bonitate und Enea Silvio Piccolomini. Zur Kanzlei der Legation Niccolò Albergatis in Arras (1435)," in *Päpste, Privilegien, Provinzen: Beiträge zur Kirchen-, Rechts- und Landesgeschichte – Festschrift für Werner Maleczek zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Johannes Giessauf, Rainer Murauer and Martin P. Schennach (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010), 291–311.

- 3 The modern edition is *Commentarii rerum memorabilium que temporibus suis contigerunt*, ed. Adriano van Heck (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1984), 45–49. An accessible edition and translation of the relevant section is provided in Pius II, *Commentaries*, I, ed. Margaret Meserve & Marcello Simonetta (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 16–28; it is to the latter that I refer below. Modern re-tellings of his trip are provided by Cecilia M. Ady, "Pius II and his Experiences of England, Scotland and the English," *English Miscellany* 9 (1958): 39–49; Rosamond J. Mitchell, *The Laurels and the Tiara. Pope Pius II, 1458–1464* (London: Harvill Press, 1962), 65–73. More general discussion of his perceptions of Britain are provided by Constance Head, "Pope Pius II as student of English History," *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 9 (1971): 187–208, and ead., "Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini's Reflections in England, 1436–1458," *Catholic Historical Review* 59 (1973): 16–38.
- 4 Pius, *Commentaries*, 18.
- 5 James Balfour Paul, "Whitekirk Church and its History," *Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society* 6 (1920–1): 119–24; Michael A. Penman, "The Economics of Faith: Approaches to Monastic Saints' Cults in Medieval Scotland," in *Religione e istituzioni religiose*

at its sunniest. He records in his *Commentarii* that from that moment he suffered the rheumatic pains that were to be his companion throughout the rest of his life.

It is little wonder, then, that he does not remember Scotland fondly in his recollections. Yet, his *Commentarii* are not a full narrative of what he suffered there: it is only from a later letter that we are told that his teeth fell out during his time in north Britain.⁶ It is another epistle that gives the lie to the description in his memoirs of his rejection of the over-solicitous attention of the local ladies: he sired a son while in Scotland (the child died in infancy).⁷ It is also the case that the specific episode that interests us does not appear in the *Commentarii* and is mentioned only in a letter written in 1451, while Piccolomini was employed at the imperial court, and sent to a German colleague, Johannes Hinderbach.⁸ The subject of the letter is the etymology of the term 'herald', which the humanist traces to the classical concept of the hero, characters lesser than the gods but greater than human and whom the letter equates with military veterans.

At the start of his epistle, the humanist recalls that: *apud Angliam, quae olim Britannia dicebatur, in sacrario nobilis aedis sancti Pauli Lundoniensis vetus historia in manus venit*.⁹ This venerable manuscript in St Paul's Cathedral, he went on to explain, contained an elegant Latin version of Thucydides, including a passage which described the generations of heroes who inhabited India from the time of Dionysus' invasion until that of Alexander. Some scholars have recounted this information without even a quiver of an eyebrow; others have felt their heart-beat quicken in surprise and hope that it is true in all its details.¹⁰ It would, indeed, be remarkable if there were a ninth-century translation of any major pagan historical work in a Latin acceptable to humanists;

nell'economia europea 1000–1800, ed. Francesco Ammannati (Florence: Florence University Press, 2012), 765–77 at 766–68.

6 Rudolf Wolkan, *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini* [Fontes rerum austriacorum, lxi, lxii, lxvii, lxviii], 3 vols. in 4 (Vienna: Holder, 1909–18), III, i, 238.

7 Pius, *Commentaries*, 24–26; Wolkan, *Briefwechsel*, I, i, 449.

8 Wolkan, *Briefwechsel*, III, i, 10–16. Gilbert Tournoy, "Enea Silvio Piccolomini nella storiografia fiamminga del Quattrocento," in *Pio II umanista europeo. Atti del XVII Convegno Internazionale (Chianciano-Pienza 18–21 luglio 2005)*, ed. Luisa Secchi Tarugi (Florence: Cesati, 2007), 317–36, discussing Adrian But's debt to Piccolomini, provides the text of the letter as it appeared, described as "de officio et origine heraldorum tractatus" in the Cologne printing of c. 1472 (ISTC ip00745000).

9 Wolkan, *Briefwechsel*, III, i, 11.

10 Contrast Mitchell, *Laurels and Tiara*, 66, and Ady, *Pius II*, 42–43, with Mandell Creighton, *The Early Renaissance in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895), 14, and

it would surely revolutionise our understanding of the Carolingian Renaissance and its interest in Greek.¹¹ What would be equally breathtaking is that, faced with such a find, a self-promoting humanist like Piccolomini did not proclaim it to the world with fanfares and *prestissimo*, but instead waited a decade and a half, and then, *sotto voce*, dropped the reference into a letter with preternatural *sprezzatura*. If this does not make us suspicious, another basic fact should: there is, naturally, no place in *The History of the Peloponnesian War* for mythical histories of India, the subject of Pius' passage. Though many have recognised that Thucydides could not have been his source, scholarship has tended either to throw up its hands or to shrug its shoulders at the quandary; the identification of a plausible alternative has been long in coming.¹²

I cannot claim that like a humanist I had to travel far or delve deep in dusty archives to unravel this conundrum – but, then, neither did pious Æneas when he composed his letter. To put the case plainly: Thucydides has no passage that describes the descent of kings in India from Dionysus to Heracles, but another Greek historian does – Flavius Arrianus. There can be no doubt that Arrian is the source for Aeneas' description, as it presents much of the same information in the same order.¹³ It might be wondered how Piccolomini came to know the text of this late antique historian; Arrian's major works, a biography of Alexander supplemented by a book entitled *Indica*, were unknown in the West until 1413, when they were brought to Italy from Byzantium, with many other texts, by Giovanni Aurispa.¹⁴ It is true that, fairly soon after its arrival, Arrian was rendered into Latin by Pier Paolo Vergerio, but that scholar's career is often taken as a case-study in the apparent dangers of accepting employment

A.M. Woodward, "Greek History at the Renaissance," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 63 (1943): 1–14 at 5.

- 11 On this topic, see Michael W. Herren ed., *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: the study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages* (London: King's College, 1988).
- 12 Wolkan, *Briefwechsel*, III, i, 111; Marianne Pade, "Thucydides" in *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, eds. Paul Oskar Kristeller, Frederick E. Cranz and Virginia Brown, 9 vols. to date (Washington D. C.: Catholic University of America, 1960–) [hereafter *CTC*], VIII (2003): 103–181 at 112. For a vague suggestion that what Piccolomini saw was "one of the texts about Alexander the Great current during the Middle Ages," see Roberto Weiss, *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century*, 4th ed., ed. David Rundle and Anthony J. Lappin (Oxford: Medium Aevum, 2009), 128, available on-line at: http://mediumaevum.modhist.ox.ac.uk/documents/Weiss_Instalment_III.pdf [accessed 9 November 2012].
- 13 Compare Wolkan, *Briefwechsel*, III, i, 11–13 with Arrian, *Indica*, vii–x (see Appendix below).
- 14 Remigio Sabbadini ed., *Carteggio di Giovanni Aurispa* (Rome: Tipografia del Senato, 1931), xiv and 159–60.

beyond humanism's Italian heartland.¹⁵ Celebrated for his early association with the *studia humanitatis* and, in particular, for his tract on education, *De Ingenuis Moribus*, Vergerio entered the service of the Holy Roman Emperor, Sigismund at the end of the Council of Constance. It is said that, in Buda, Vergerio 'disappeared into obscurity'; it was there, probably in the mid-1430s, that he produced his translation of Arrian.¹⁶ His work was not known in Italy during his own lifetime and only reached the peninsula when the autograph copy was offered as a gift to Alfonso the Magnanimous, King of Naples in 1454; at that court, the cabal of scholars was unimpressed by Vergerio's prose and went about refining it "to such an effect that the original Arrian was almost completely obscured in the process, but at least it was now in elegant Latin."¹⁷ If we ask who it was that made a present of the work to Alfonso, the answer is none other than Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini. He had followed Vergerio's footsteps into imperial employ and in his master's library had found this work. He had shown it, in the mid-1440s, to his former colleague, Tommaso Parentucelli, who had a copy made.¹⁸ He also mentioned it in his own educational treatise, recommending "Arrian, whom Pier Paolo translated" as a suitable text for the classroom.¹⁹ That treatise was written the year before his letter to Hinderbach.

In short, there was no copy of Thucydides; there was no ninth-century manuscript; there was no discovery on the hallowed ground of St Paul's.²⁰

-
- 15 For Vergerio's career, see John M. McManamon, *Pierpaolo Vergerio the Elder: The Humanist as Orator* (Tempe AZ: Medieval & Renaissance Studies & Texts, 1996); Leonardo Smith ed., *Epistolario di Pier Paolo Vergerio* (Rome: Tipografia del Senato, 1934).
 - 16 Quotation from John R. Hale, *The Thames and Hudson Dictionary of the Italian Renaissance* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1981), 331; for comment, see David Rundle, "The Structures of Contacts" in *Humanism in Fifteenth-Century Europe* ed. David Rundle (Oxford: Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature, 2012), 307–35 at 309–10. On the translation, see Phillip A. Stadter, "Arrianus," *CTC* III (1976): 1–20 at 3–5; McManamon, *Pierpaolo Vergerio*, 157–8.
 - 17 Woodward, "Greek History at the Renaissance," 8.
 - 18 The copy is now Paris BnF, MS nouv. acq. lat. 1302. It is the only extant manuscript cited by Stadter in *CTC* III, 5 but there is another codex recorded in Kristeller, *Iter* III, 117b, Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS 9893–9894, fols. 1–116 (non vidi).
 - 19 *Humanist Educational Treatises*, ed. Craig W. Kallendorf (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 224.
 - 20 The first translation of Thucydides was, of course, that of Lorenzo Valla, a friend of Aeneas, made at the behest of Aeneas' former colleague, Nicholas V. That translation was completed in 1452 and there is no evidence that news of the work reached Aeneas ahead its completion. On the translation, see Pade, "Thucydides" *CTC* VIII, 120–126 and, for the sole extant letter between Valla and Piccolomini, see *Laurentii Valle Epistole*, eds. Ottavio Besomi and Mariangela Regoliosi (Padua: Antenore, 1984), no. 20 [243–44].

Piccolomini was, in fact, working from a humanist translation of another Greek author, available to him at his desk. This much, I should say, will not come as a complete surprise to the best scholars. While I was unpicking this issue, so was another – and Gilbert Tournoy has already demonstrated Piccolomini's debt in print.²¹ All that leaves me to do on that specific point is to provide, as it were, chapter and verse corroborating the insight by presenting in an appendix the relevant passages of Vergerio's translation alongside portions of the text of the epistle. But, before you turn the page, I want us to consider further what Piccolomini was up to in his letter; we now know the detail of what was happening but what was going on?

We can discount the possibility that the mention of Thucydides is simply a *lapsus calami*, the humanist misremembering his source's identity; the detail he provides of his supposed discovery demonstrates that. We can also exclude the suggestion that it was done to fool his correspondent; their intellectual proximity and the fact that Hinderbach most likely knew Vergerio's translation of Arrian militates against it.²² We should suspect that something more is afoot – and the conclusion of Piccolomini's letter strengthens our suspicion. There, having given his made-up genealogy of the concept of the herald, he reiterates his spurious claim that the term had, in the ancient world, been reserved for men who had seen active service in battle – but, he goes on, why the term is now used by base men who have never fought, he could not tell, unless it was that everything is subject to decline: *cur autem nostris diebus qui nunquam militarunt et abiecti quidam homines hoc nomen assequuntur, nescio causam, nisi quia omnia degenerant...*²³ It is a comment that might remind the reader of the manner in which another humanist began a tract on a similar topic: Leonardo Bruni, writing thirty years before Piccolomini, opened his *De militia* by saying he was curious to investigate the origins of the military, a tradition which, he said: *verum ita per varios degeneravit mores, ita per*

21 Gilbert Tournoy, "La storiografia greca nell' Umanesimo: Arriano, Pier Paolo Vergerio e Enea Silvio Piccolomini," *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 55 (2006): 1–8. I owe a debt of gratitude to the learned Tournoy for his correspondence with me on this issue. His article presents in appendix the letters of Piccolomini relating to his presentation of Vergerio's translation to Alfonso v.

22 On Hinderbach, I have found useful Daniela Rando, *Dai margini la memoria: Johannes Hinderbach (1418–1486)* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2003); Fabrizio Leonardelli, "Pro bibliotheca erigenda." *Manoscritti e incunaboli del vescovo di Trento Iohannes Hinderbach (1465–1486)* (Trent: Biblioteca Comunale, 1989); *I manoscritti medievali della biblioteca comunale di Trento*, ed. Adriana Paolini (Florence: SISMEL Galluzzo, 2006), *sub indice*. For his knowledge of the Arrian translation, see Rando, *Dai margini*, 192.

23 Wolkan, *Briefwechsel*, III, i, 15.

*multa secula e via deflexit, ut proprie videatur nature primevique instituti parva admodum vestigia retinere.*²⁴ Bruni proceeds by discussing Greek authors – Hippodamus and Phileas of Carthage – whose texts were no more available to him than Thucydides to Piccolomini, but he had culled knowledge of them honestly, through his study of Aristotle's *Politics*. If there are similarities of outlook and approach between Bruni and Piccolomini, and if, indeed, the latter is intentionally echoing the former, there is also a substantial contrast. Bruni's criticism of modernity is up-front, while Piccolomini's undercuts what has gone before, subverting the apparently straightforward celebration of the institution of the herald. Except, of course, that the description is not straightforward – and that, surely, is the purpose of his fabrication of his 'discovery': it is intended to alert the sharp-eyed *lecteur*, to act as a warning for those who have ears to hear.

It is not, I would contend, simply a case that a reader aware of either or both Arrian and Thucydides would recognise something is amiss. Nor is it simply that the distant setting for the author's act of archival archaeology is supposed to seem improbable (however thin the pickings Poggio found during his years in England).²⁵ There is something more here – a submerged reference that, if brought to the surface, should cause the alarm to be sounded. If we accept that Piccolomini made a conscious choice in the location and the identity of his specious discovery then we can say, in brief, that what he found was a *Britannus Thucydides*. Placing that place and that name together would not have been original to the humanist, for he could have found them used as feigned praise, mocking a certain poet called Cimber, in a satire by Vergil. He could have not known that phrase from the poem itself but, instead, he would have read it in the few lines quoted by Quintilian:

Quaedam tamen adhuc vetera vetustate ipsa gratius nitent, quaedam et necessario interim sumuntur, ut 'nuncupare' et 'fari': multa alia etiam

24 The text is now most readily available in Leonardo Bruni, *Opere letterarie e politiche*, ed. Paolo Viti (Turin: Unione tipografica, 1996), 654 (and cf. 698). This is based on the edition of Charles C. Bayley, *War and Society in Renaissance Florence. The De Militia of Leonardo Bruni* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), with the quotation above at 369; Bayley provides a discussion of the structure of Bruni's text at *War and Society*, 317–36.

25 I discuss Poggio's English 'exile' in *England and Humanism*; for the time being, see David Rundle, "On the difference between Virtue and Weiss: Humanist Texts in England during the Fifteenth Century," in *Courts, Counties and the Capital in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. Diana Dunn (New York: St Martin's Press, 1996), 181–203.

audentius inseri possunt, sed ita demum si non appareat adfectatio, in quam mirifice Vergilius:

Corinthiorum amator iste verborum,
Thucydides Britannus, Atticae febres,
tau Gallicum, min et sphin – et male illisit:
ita omnia ista verba miscuit fratri.
Cimber hic fuit...²⁶

Piccolomini made the choices he did when constructing his history as a hunter-gatherer because they allowed him to allude to a fragment of an ancient author known through another whose complete work had recently been rediscovered. Not only that, but the passage in Quintilian, as quoted above, is discussing the possible use of archaic terms – and, of course, what the future Pius is doing in his epistle is creating an antique aura for a modern term. I must say that I, for one, cannot but sit back and admire the neatness of what he has done. He has given us not an episode in the history of archival archaeology but a subtle testimony to the humanist cult of those activities. But he has also done something rather more: I have talked above about the description of his ‘discovery’ acting as an alert, a warning or an alarm. I deployed those terms because it seems to me that what is going on in this letter is that Piccolomini is demonstrating his mastery of that rhetorical technique known as *dissimulatio* or *ironia*: the art, as Cicero put it (in another re-found work), of saying something but meaning something else (*alia dicuntur ac sentias*).²⁷ Cicero advises, in such cases, that the orator’s intention can be signified by some small thing (*parva res*) – and it is as such a gesture or hint that, I would suggest, Piccolomini opens his epistle with the tale of his supposed exploits, his allusion to his *Britannus Thucydides* letting the reader know they need to be careful when they read what follows.²⁸

Yet, some might want to object, the implication of this discussion is that the future pope lied. That is true enough, but it hardly places Piccolomini apart

26 Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, VIII.3.xxvii–xxix. It should be noted that, in the Appendix Vergiliana, the relevant poem, Catalepton II, actually reads “Thucydides tyrannus.” There is recent discussion in David K. Oosterhuis, “The ‘Catalepton’: Myths of Virgil” (unpublished PhD. thesis, University of Minnesota, 2007), 76–102.

27 Cicero, *De oratore*, II.lxvii.269–70. Generally on the topic, see Dilwyn Knox, *Ironia: Medieval and Renaissance Ideas on Irony* (Leiden: Brill, 1989).

28 Similar (but not quite parallel) examples of Piccolomini inviting a suspicious reading of his texts are provided by Keith Sidwell, “Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini’s *De curialium miseriis* and Peter of Blois,” in *Pius II ‘el più expeditivo pontifice’: Selected Studies on Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (1405–1464)*, eds. Zweder von Martels and Arie Vanderjagt (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 87–106.

from his fellow scholars. What is at fault in that reaction is not the humanists themselves but our desire that those we wish to consider our intellectual forefathers should act like the heroes we want them to be. But, as anyone who has studied a Poggio or a Filelfo or, indubitably, a George of Trebizond knows, these were not peaceable souls, their minds solely on quiet contemplation and shunning any baser activities. Obviously, we may account it progress that we can name no intellectuals nowadays with a hot head or sharp tongue or roaming hands; we know that temperance in all things is the modern academic's watchword; and we may be proud that scholarship has successfully purged itself of the humour and the playfulness that bedevilled even Pius. We might, indeed, claim that modernity has not made life degenerate but, rather, refined. Oh, brave new world.

• • •

There is a coda to this discussion. Piccolomini's epistle was not one of those *opuscula* that quickly became forgotten. On the contrary, like many of his works it gained an international reputation in the decades after his death. It was printed at Cologne as *de officio et origine heraldorum tractatus* in the early 1470s and, from that edition, became the basis for a discussion of heralds by Adrian de But.²⁹ Meanwhile, in England, the epistle became one of the first and one of the few humanist texts to be translated into the English vernacular in the fifteenth century. Its circulation in manuscript suggests that its readers in the country where the discovery of the Latin Thucydides is supposed to have occurred took the text as a sober disquisition on the history of heraldry.³⁰ They, like But, became the butts (unwitting and unintended) of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini's learned humour. They provide an object-lesson in how irony – the mode of expression which escapes any attempts to have an agreed punctuation mark imposed upon it (despite John Wilkins, Alcanter de Brahm, and emoticons) – is difficult to identify. Of course, those early readers

29 Tournoy, "Enea Silvio Piccolomini nella storiografia fiamminga."

30 Copies of the Latin text with British provenance are: London, British Library, MSS Harl. 6149, fols. 79–82 and Stowe 668, fols. 3–5, and Oxford, Queens College, MS 161, fols. 63–64^v. It is also recorded in the contents list to Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 6729A but does not now appear in the manuscript, which was owned by John Gunthorp. The English translation is available in the following medieval manuscripts: London, College of Arms, MS 63, fols. 41–51^v and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 764, fols. 1–8, with Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 271, fols. 64^v–73 (s. xv²), presenting a text which begins with this translation but soon diverges; there are also several copies of the translation from the sixteenth century or later.

of Piccolomini were not the only ones who failed to get the joke. At the same time, perhaps there were a few who chortled. If nothing else, we can say for certain that Piccolomini's engagement with the practice of humanist archival archaeology did not stop with his own demise. In the early sixteenth century, the Scotsman Hector Boece announced to the world that he himself had rediscovered some long-lost manuscripts. Their story was this: there was a Scottish king present at the Fall of Rome in 410 AD who took a chest of books for safe-keeping to the far-off Hebridean island of Iona. Boece admits he was not the first to know of them: he heard tell that, when visiting Scotland, the future Pius II wanted to travel to the Hebrides in the hope of unearthing those venerable books and finding, in particular, lost sections of the text of Livy – but circumstances did not allow the journey to take place.³¹ The tale is implausible in so many aspects, not least the idea that Piccolomini, after his recent experience, would willingly step onto another ship setting out for the North Sea. Did Boece make it up simply because he wanted to place himself in association with a humanist who had achieved such pre-eminence? Or did he mention Piccolomini's name because he had read the epistle in which he announced his Thucydides and recognised it for the fabrication it was? Was Boece, then, providing that small thing which should let us know that some dissimulation is occurring here? We cannot know. We are left only with the certainty that this Scotsman wanted to present himself as a participant in the humanist escapades of archival archaeology in which a few were hunter-gatherers, but others were farmers, harvesting a reputation from the tales they nurtured in their adventurous prose.

Appendix

Piccolomini's Debt to Pier Paolo Vergerio's Translation of Arrian

I have used the copy of Pier Paolo Vergerio's translation of Arrian, which is Paris, BnF, MS nouv. acq. lat. 1302; *De rebus indicis* begins at fol. 139. I have compared it with the text as provided by Wolkan, *Briefweschel* (see n. 8 above), marking specific verbal echoes with superscript letters.

31 Hector Boethius, *Scotorum Historiae a prima gentis origine . . .* ([Paris], 1526). fol. cxviii^r-v. The tale is discussed by John MacQueen, "Aspects of Humanism in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Literature," in id., ed., *Humanism in Renaissance Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990), 10–31 at 21–22. See further Rundle, *England and the Identity of Humanism*.

Paris, BnF, MS nouv. acq. lat. 1302

Wolkan, 11–12

[fol. 142^v] Olim quidem igitur indi fuerunt pastores sicut scythe qui non sunt aratores sed in curribus errant aliam atque aliam partem scythie permutantes non inhabitantes in urbibus neque templa deorum colentes sic neque indis olim urbes erant neque deorum templa fabricata sed induebant quidem pelles ferarum quasunque interficiebant comedebant autem ^acortices arborum^a vocantur autem arbores ille indorum lingua tala et nascitur in illis quemadmodum in arboribus palmarum cura summitates quasi pinguedo [*sic*] quaedam Comedebant autem et de animalibus silvestribus quaecunque ceperant ^bcrudas carnes^b & hoc priusquam dionysius venisset in terram indorum. Dionysio autem adveniente postquam obtinuit indos condidit urbes et urbibus leges posuit ^cfuitque indis dator vini quemadmodum & graecis^c ac docuit seminari terram dans eis semina sive non praeterierint hinc triptolemus quando missus fuit a cerere ad seminandum totam terram sive ante triptolemum aliquis iste dionysius adveniens in terra indorum dedit eis semina frugum domesticarum. Primusque dionysius ^diugavit boves sub aratro^d & ma[fol. 143]iorem indorum fecit aratores loco pastorum ^earmavitque eos armis martialibus^e ac ^fdeos colere^f docuit cum alios cum se maxime cymbalizando ac tymanizando saltationem quoque satyricam docuit quae apud graecos appellatur cordata sed & ^gnutrire comam indos in honorem

... Dionysius, qui etiam primus armatus et cum exercitu invasit Indiam ac rudes illos et agrestes homines, ^acorticibus arborum^a et ^bcrudis ferarum carnibus^b utentes, in urbes legit, ^dboves aratro iungere^d, frumenta serere, ^fdeos colere^f, ^gnutrire comam, mitram ferre et unctiones docuit ungentorum^g. ^cfuitque his dator vini sicut et Grecis^c ^earmavit eos armis martialibus^e et ad usum vite cultoris erexit.

(cont.)

Paris, BnF, MS nouv. acq. lat. 1302

Wolkan, 11–12

ipsius ac ferre mitram ostendit unctiones
docuit unguentorum^g. Itaque usque in
tempus Alexandri sub cymbalis ac
tympanis indi constituebantur in pugna.

Recedens autem dionysius de terra
indorum postquam ista ordinaverat
constituit regem illius patriae
^hspartembam unum ex amicis
bacchosissimum^h.

Mortuo autem spartemba recepit regnum
budian [*sic*] filius eius et pater quidem
ⁱregnavit super indos quinaquaginta et
duos annosⁱ filius vero viginti cuius filius
cradeva regnum post eum recepit
& exinde per longum tempus secundum
genus permutaverunt regnum filius a
patre suscipiens eique succedens Si vero
deficiat genus tunc secundum
excellentiam probitatis indis reges
constitui.

hercules autem quem ad indos venisse
fama obtinet ab indis dicitur fuisse
indigena Iste hercules maxime apud
surasenos gentem indicam colitur ubi
sunt urbes due magne videlicet {e}
methora et elisobora ac fluvius iobares
navigabilis defluit per terram ipsorum
Ornatum autem quem iste hercules

[*Dionysius decides to retire from India and
addresses his troops, ending:*]

ceterum ^hex amicis meis bacchosissimum
Spartebam^h vobis regem Indisque
constituo, qui vobis alimenta prebeat et
annuas stipes, qui custodiat privilegia
vestra et honoratos vos habeat ex grege
vestro ad regni fastigium evocatus. vos ille
consulite et posteris. cuius si genus
defuerit, ex vobis vestrisque liberis reges
Indorum sumite.

atque sic adhortatus heroas Dionysius ex
India duxit exercitum.

Spartembas autem ⁱregnavit super Indos
quingenta et duos annosⁱ Budamque
filium successorem reliquit, qui cum
regnasset annos viginti, instituto filio
Cradena vitam finivit.
ac post eum per duodecim generationes
heroum soboles usque ad Herculem
regnavit in India.

Hercules autem, cum domitis terrarum
monstris ac sevitia tyrannorum deleta
penetrasset Indiam, regnum heroum in se
recepit. privilegia tamen his non ademit,
sed auxit eorum numerum conscriptis
inter eos, qui secum ab Hispania et
Mauritania militaverant et contra
Gerionem triplicis anime et Anteum,

Paris, BnF, MS nouv. acq. lat. 1302	Wolkan, 11–12
<p>deferebat megasthenes dicit fuisse thebano herculi similem sicut ipsimet indi narrant et</p> <p>quod huic valde ^jmulti fuerunt filii masculi in terra indorum, multis enim mulieribus matrimonio iunctus fuit sed filiam micam [<i>sic</i>: unicam] habuit fuit autem nomen huic puellae Pandeae^j Terra autem in qua nata est et quam commisit ei hercules ut in ipsa dominaretur ex nomine puellae pandea appellatur.</p> <p>Fueruntque illi a patre ^kelephantes quidem circa quingentos equitatus autem ad quatuor milia peditum vero ad centum et triginta milia^k . . .</p>	<p>terre filium, arma tulerant, longis itineribus et senecta etate defunctis.</p> <p>sed cum venisset ad mortem ^jmultosque filios haberet, multis enim mulieribus matrimonio iunctus fuit, unicam autem filiam sustulisset, Pandeam nomine^j, huic regnum commisit.</p> <p>et ut ostenderet, heroas quanti faceret pre ceteris liberis, unum ex numero heroum, nomine Jobarem, virum filie dedit, qui regem gereret quingentosque huic ^kelephantes, quatuor milia equitum et centum triginta milia peditum^k constituit, quibus regnum tueretur . . .</p>

Petrus Crinitus and Ancient Latin Poetry

Christopher S. Celenza

The late fifteenth and early sixteenth century in Florence, from roughly 1490 to 1510, is a period notable for many reasons. The end of Medici rule, the Savonarolan ascendancy, and the beginning of the Italian wars mark this time as an important period of transition. As to intellectual life, it is noteworthy (among many other developments) that, by the end of the fifteenth century, almost all of the primary textual resources currently available to study the ancient world had been discovered. The time had come to consolidate these gains, to find ways to order them, and to create the resources that would thenceforth be used to address the study of the classical world.

A figure emblematic of this moment is Pietro del Riccio Baldi, more commonly known by his Latinized name, Petrus Crinitus.¹ The fifth of nine children, Crinitus was born in 1474, and he fast became a precocious young scholar, studying with Paolo Sassi da Ronciglione, the (now) controversial teacher of Niccolò Machiavelli.² Crinitus also studied with Ugolino Verino (1438–1516), before passing to the circle of Angelo Poliziano (1454–94).³ Crinitus became not

- 1 For recent literature on Crinitus, see Michelangiola Marchiari, “Petro Crinito (Pietro del Riccio Baldi), in *Autografi dei letterati italiani: Il Quattrocento*, eds. Francesco Bausi, Maurizio Campanelli, Sebastiano Gentile, James Hankins (Rome: Salerno, 2013), 123–37; Anna Mastrogianni, *Die Poemata des Petrus Crinitus und ihre Horazimitation: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Hamburg: LIT, 2002), 1–14; Jean-Louis Charlet, “Le choix des mètres dans les *poemata* de Pietro Crinito,” *Bibliothèque de l’humanisme et renaissance* 67 (2005): 17–26; Daniel J. Nodest, “The Poems *Ex graeco* by Petrus Crinitus and the Validation of his Major themes,” *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 11 (2005): 524–37; Francesco Bausi, “Crinitus, P.,” in *Enciclopedia oraziana*, 3 vols. (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 1996–98), 183–4. Other works employed here include: Carmine Di Pierro, “Zibaldoni autografi di Angelo Poliziano inediti e sconosciuti nella Reale biblioteca di Monaco,” *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, 55 (1910): 1–32; Lodovico Frati, “Uno zibaldone di Pietro Crinito,” *Archivio storico italiano* (1913): 373–9. There is much information on Crinitus’s life and work in Carlo Angeleri, “Introduzione,” in *Petrus Crinitus, De honesta disciplina*, ed. Carlo Angeleri (Rome: Fratelli Bocca, 1955), 1–55.
- 2 For the controversy see Francesco Bausi, “Machiavelli molestato?” *Interpres* 24 (2005): 266–71 and the article of Robert Black in this volume.
- 3 There are letters from Verino to Crinitus in MS Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 2621; and in his *De illustratione urbis florentinae libri tres* (Paris: Stephanus, 1583), II, 14, Verino speaks of

only Poliziano's main pupil in Florence, but also, effectively, Poliziano's literary executor. He edited Poliziano's letters and other work and committed the text, to Aldo Manuzio, that became Poliziano's still used, un-paginated *Complete Works*.⁴ Crinitus died relatively young, in 1507, at the age of thirty-three.⁵

Crinitus's connection with Poliziano is important for two reasons. First, Crinitus internalized Poliziano's comprehensive vision of what an authentically engaged scholar should do. Poliziano sketched out, in his *Lamia*, what he saw as the competency of the *grammaticus*, "grammarian" or even "philologist."⁶ This term typically designated a teacher of grammar (through the study of poetry), but for Poliziano it represented much more. For Poliziano, the term *grammaticus* indicated a scholar who was both unafraid to read widely and not imprisoned by traditional disciplinary boundaries. Crinitus inherited this passion to address many traditionally distinct genres of written culture from his beloved mentor, and he had evolved a plan to pursue this aim.

Second, Crinitus represents the next phase in this evolution. Poliziano, Crinitus's mentor, had written the manifestoes, fought the battles, and encompassed the past century's struggles. But Crinitus's *oeuvre* (both the works he brought to completion and those he intended to write) signals a generational transition. Once this transition is noticed, it seems as clear in its own right as the generational transition that David Quint, in his study of Bruni's *Dialogues*, highlighted in the era of Leonardo Bruni.⁷ To understand this moment of transition, we need to look at Crinitus's intended sequence of works, only three of which he was able to complete.

We find the list of these intended works in the letter of presentation attached to Crinitus's *De honesta disciplina*, the work for which Crinitus is best known. It represents well the type of literary composition that so intrigued the

Crinitus's poetry in the following fashion: "Discipulique mei Criniti carmina Petri aeternum vivent..."

4 Angelo Poliziano, *Opera Omnia* (Venice: Aldus Manutius, 1498).

5 As noted in Florence, Archivio di Stato, Obituari dell'Arte dei medici et speziali, reg. n. 248, c.19, sotto l'anno 1507: "A dì luglio 1507, Piero di Bartolomeo d'Antonio del Riccio Baldi recato in S. Felice in Piazza." Cit. in Angeleri, "Introduzione," 16.

6 Angelo Poliziano, *Lamia: Praelectio in priora Aristotelis analytica*, ed. Ari Wesseling (Leiden: Brill, 1986); see Christopher S. Celenza, ed., *Poliziano's Lamia in Context* (Leiden: Brill, 2010) for literature.

7 See David Quint, "Humanism and Modernity: A Reconsideration of Bruni's *Dialogues*," *Renaissance Quarterly* 38 (1985): 423–45; see also Riccardo Fubini, "All'uscita della scolastica medievale: Salutati, Bruni, e i *Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum*," *Archivio storico italiano* 150 (1992): 1065–103; and Ronald G. Witt, *In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 432–42.

generation of Poliziano, inspired as it was by Aulus Gellius's *Attic Nights*. The letter attached to the treatise was written by Benedetto Filologo to Scipione Carteromacho, and in it Benedetto characterizes Crinitus as someone who, from his youth, has been intent on "energetically and thoroughly studying every aspect of antiquity and commenting on these matters with the greatest care."⁸ Filologo lists Crinitus's works, and he suggests to his correspondent that these works are imminent: "Be well, and within a short time expect all of these works noted below: *Epistolicarum responsionum libri xx. De Grammaticis latinis, De poetis, De oratoribus et historicis, libri xv. Promiscuarum quaestionum, libri x. Parthenicorum sermonum et poematum libri III.*"⁹

The list shows that Crinitus was interested in the kinds of miscellanistic work that had also captivated Poliziano. It also reveals that Crinitus had a strong Suetonian interest. Suetonius's vast set of *Lives* of illustrious men (over and above his now famous *Lives of the Caesars*) included historians, philosophers, and orators; within that set of *Lives*, there was a work preserved as a distinct text, with its own tradition, which was known to and used extensively by Poliziano, and which Crinitus claims as a model: Suetonius's *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*.¹⁰

The importance of this Suetonian moment lies in the fact that it reveals an enterprise of referencing and consolidation. Crinitus's goal is to systematize available information concerning ancient writers, and as he does so we can observe him wrestling with matters, especially related to chronology, that are

8 Benedetto Filologo to Scipione Carteromacho, in Crinitus, *De honesta disciplina*, 487: "Testis ego sum quantis ille laboribus, quanta diligentia in bonis literis hactenus desudavit, ut quam nihil potius aut antiquius vita habuerit quam id aliquando consequi, ut omnem prorsus antiquitatem studiose perlegeret ac diligentissime observaret." Crinitus expresses similar feelings about Benedetto Filologo in *De honesta disciplina*, 18, 2 (357), where Benedetto Filologo is described as a "vir unus aetate nostra qui de omni antiquitate sit optime meritus..." On Benedetto Filologo (= Benedetto Ricciardini), see Mario Cosenza, *A Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of Italian Humanists*, 6 vols. (Boston: Hall, 1962), IV, 3040; V, 1533; VI, 247; and Giulio Negri, *Istoria degli scrittori fiorentini* (Ferrara: Bernardino Pomatelli, 1722), 92. On Scipione Carteromacho see Francesco Piovani, "Forteguerra (Carteromacho), Scipione," in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* XLIX (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1997), 163–66.

9 Ibid.: "Vale et brevi eiusdem haec omnia, quae inferius notabuntur, expecta: *Epistolicarum responsionum, libri xx. De Grammaticis latinis. De poetis. De oratoribus et historicis, libri xv. Promiscuarum quaestionum, libri x. Parthenicorum sermonum et poematum libri III.*"

10 See Suetonius, *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, ed. Giorgio Brugnoli (Leipzig: Teubner, 1960); id., *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, ed. with comm. by Robert A. Kaster (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995); Robert A. Kaster, *Studies on the Text of Suetonius De grammaticis et rhetoribus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

scarcely imaginable today. His work *On Latin Poets*, the only one of these reference type books that survives, offers insight into these concerns. Appearing in 1505, it is divided into ninety-five chapters and five books, and it covers every known ancient Latin poet, from Livius Andronicus (c.284–204 BCE) to Sidonius Apollinaris (c.430–489 CE).¹¹

There are at least two ways to approach this work. The first is to focus on the historical scheme within it, around which Crinitus frames his discussion of Latin poets. Each of the five books possesses its own preface, and together they help us understand Crinitus's historical vision. The second is to examine how Crinitus deals with a specific author (some of which can be seen through the examination of manuscript evidence). These approaches reveal a thinker with a specific vision of the place and evolution of poetry in society, even as Crinitus's occasional struggles offer us a window into an emerging culture of early modern reference books and information management that has become the subject of recent scholarly attention.¹²

Crinitus's vision of the progress of ancient Latin poetry is tied to a standard view of birth, growth, and decline, and it is not unlike Isidore of Seville's version of the progress of the Latin language. Isidore divided his scheme into four periods: ancient or *prisca* (the earliest Latin, set in the mythical era of Ianus and Saturnus); Latin or *latina* (the language of Latium, in which the Twelve Tables were written); Roman (which represented the succeeding period and included Plautus, Virgil, and Cicero among others); and finally "mixed," or *mixta* (which occurred as Roman power declined, corrupting the language with solecisms and barbarisms).¹³ This basic medieval background is important in viewing Crinitus's historical schema, as is the fifteenth-century discussion on the spoken language of ancient Rome that had come before him. That discussion began with the memorable encounter of Biondo Flavio and Leonardo Bruni, and continued through Poggio Bracciolini, Lorenzo Valla, Angelo Decembrio,

11 Petrus Crinitus, *De poetis latinis* (Florence: Giunta, 1505), unpaginated.

12 See Ann Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

13 Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, ed. Wallace M. Lindsay (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), 9.1: "Latinas autem linguas quattuor esse quidam dixerunt, id est Priscam, Latinam, Romanam, Mixtam. Prisca est, quam vetustissimi Italiae sub Iano et Saturno sunt usi, incondita, ut se habent carmina Saliorum. Latina, quam sub Latino et regibus Tusci et ceteri in Latio sunt locuti, ex qua fuerunt duodecim tabulae scriptae. Romana, quae post reges exactos a populo Romano coepta est, qua Naevius, Plautus, Ennius, Vergilius poetae, et ex oratoribus Gracchus et Cato et Cicero vel ceteri effuderunt. Mixta, quae post imperium latius promotum simul cum moribus et hominibus in Romanam civitatem inrupit, integritatem verbi per soloecismos et barbarismos corrumpens."

Guarino da Verona, and Francesco Filelfo.¹⁴ Did ancient Romans speak a language that was relatively formal, similar to what was preserved as written Latin? Or did they have, instead, a vernacular that was distinct from their written tongue? To sum up a long and involved debate: at the beginning of this period, even an excellent Ciceronian Latinist like Bruni believed that Latin in antiquity had been, as it was for moderns, an ‘artificial’ language, one with its own idealized set of uniform rules. For Bruni, even in the era of Cicero, there had been Latin, and there had been a separate vernacular. By the end of the debate, and by the end of the fifteenth century, almost everyone who thought about this question believed the opposite: that ancient Latin had been a natural language with a cycle of birth, growth, and decline. The gathering of hitherto little studied sources for studying the Latin language dovetailed with new ways of explaining its history, function, and place in society.

Crinitus’s vision of the progress of ancient Latin poetry reflects these earlier developments. When it comes to *De poetis latinis*, that work’s prefatory letter, along with the individual prefaces to its five different books, together provide an effective means to gauge both Crinitus’s enterprise overall and his theories regarding the development of ancient Latin poetry. To begin with the prefatory letter: after highlighting his debt to Suetonius’s *On Grammarians and Rhetoricians*, Crinitus makes an interesting comment about chronology: “In the entire project almost nothing gave me more trouble than what has been handed down about the poets’ eras, since the sources, for the most part, differ greatly among themselves.”¹⁵ This concern for chronology is something that spanned Crinitus’s entire career (as early work of his on Sidonius Apollinaris shows, to be examined below).

The prefatory letter contains another aspect linking it to Crinitus’s other work: his interest in ritual and religion. In the preface to Book One, we can observe this trajectory in his comments on the origins of poetry among the Romans. Early on the Romans were virtuous and “a Roman citizen was praised as good to the extent that he was a good farmer and a strong soldier.”¹⁶ But about four hundred years after the founding of the City, when the Romans

14 This paragraph draws on Christopher S. Celenza, “End Game: Humanist Latin in the Late Fifteenth Century,” in *Latinitas Perennis II: Appropriation and Latin Literature*, eds., Yanick Maes, Jan Papy, and Wim Verbaal (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 201–42.

15 Crinitus, *De poetis latinis*, prefatory letter: “Et sane nihil toto opere magis me ipsum varie agitavit quam diversa scriptorum traditio de temporibus, cum magna ex parte inter se longe dissentiant.”

16 Ibid., pref. to book one: “Sic laudabatur bonus civis Romae ut bonus colonus et fortis miles.”

had achieved power and then relative peace through military triumph, people began to think more formally about poetry. The art, initially despised as something for *crassatores* ("blockheads") had its true origin in religious ritual and ceremony: "Even in the days when Numa Pompilius ruled and the citizenry was armed, the 'Songs of the Salians' were created, which the shield-bearing priests of Mars Gradivus sang out on certain days as they danced their solemn, three-jumped dance."¹⁷ "Soon thereafter," Crinitus goes on, "certain songs and sacrificial hymns became popular," and Romans became accustomed to relaying praises of the gods and prophecies in verse.¹⁸

This link between poetry and religion reminds one of Crinitus's *De honesta disciplina*, a miscellany in which, at the end, he apologizes to readers. He writes that he wants people to understand that in reporting so much about the religion of the ancients in all its different aspects, he did so in order to serve the cause of the humanities, not to approve superstition.¹⁹ Still, this interest in the plurality of religions served as a powerful underpinning to the work of many Renaissance thinkers. An anthropological interest in ancient religions (as a later age might term the phenomenon) can be observed as early as Boccaccio's *Genealogia deorum* and as late as Lilio Gregorio Giraldi's *De deis gentium* in the middle sixteenth century, and it seems both a by-product of interest in ancient literature and a way to understand ancient culture in all its fullness.²⁰

In any case, once leading men took to poetry, it gained cultural legitimacy.²¹ Here we see the other side of Crinitus's view concerning poetry and literature:

-
- 17 Ibid.: "Imperante adhuc Numa Pompilio et occupata iam tum armis civitate Saliorum carmina facta sunt, quae sacerdotes Gradivi Martis ancilia gestantes cum tripudiis et sollemni saltatu certis diebus decantarent." Crinitus draws on Livy, 1.20.4; Ovid, *Fast.*, 3.387.
 - 18 Ibid.: "Paulo mox cantica quaedam et devotionum sacra vulgata sunt laudesque deorum immortalium versibus absolutae . . ."
 - 19 Crinitus, *De honesta disciplina*, 485: "Quod sicubi de veterum diis ac religione, ut fit, disserui, hoc ipsum propterea factum a nobis ut litteris humanioribus consuleremus. Neque renovare quicquam volumus, aut eam superstitionem probare, ut quidem temere obloquuntur, quam non modo reieci ut vanam et improbam, sed ut nefariam flagitiosamque locis multis coargui."
 - 20 See Giovanni Boccaccio, *Genealogie deorum gentilium*, ed. Vittore Branca, vol. 7–8 of *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, 10 vols., ed. Branca (Milan: Mondadori, 1964–92); and Lelio Gregorio Giraldi, *De deis gentium* (Basel, 1548; repr. New York: Garland, 1976).
 - 21 Crinitus, *De poetis latinis*, pref. to Book one: "Factum tamen est, ut paulo mox [*i.e.*, soon after M. Fulvius Nobilior took Ennius with him to Aetolia] principes etiam viri aucto imperio et domi forisque pace adepta ad hanc studiorum partem animum inclinarint summoque cultu atque honore illos habuerunt, qui carmine absolvendo viderentur admodum excellere."

it flourishes when the right kind of political power is in place, something on which he will have more to say. Book Two takes us from Lucretius to the era immediately before Virgil, and it is apparent from the preface that Crinitus sees this epoch as a preliminary period of the marriage between power and literature. Still, “it is unbelievable, once power grew and prosperity was achieved, how quickly the city itself became proficient in every branch of learning.”²² Yet it is only in Book Three that Crinitus arrives at the period when “all the noble branches of learning reached their pinnacle, together with Rome’s power.”²³ Crinitus goes on:

As far as this subject goes, when I mull over the condition of mortals, I believe that it matters quite a lot, in human affairs, in what era men live and especially in what communities they live their lives. For when Augustus ruled, it seems obvious that things went so favorably and fortunately for the human race that no one could doubt that power was wielded throughout those times with the greatest guidance and counsel, and that all the branches of erudition shone in the highest degree in Rome.²⁴

It was not during the Republic but only under the rule of Augustus that conditions were perfect for the real flourishing of literature and learning. Crinitus continues: “When Roman power was strong, the most famous minds in the City were outstanding, and not only in poetry but also in all the other branches of learning that are customarily considered to belong to the liberal arts.”²⁵ Political power and Roman dominion created the right environment for cultural progress. Then, however, vice increased: an immoderate desire for

22 Ibid., Pref. to Book two: “Nam civitas ipsa imperio aucto et rebus prospere gestis, incredibile dictu est, quam brevi tempore in omni studiorum genere profecerit.”

23 Ibid., Pref. to Book three: “Perventum est ad ea tempora, Cosme Pont. Arretine, quibus omnes bonae disciplinae accesserunt ad summum fastigium una cum maiestate Romani imperii.”

24 Ibid.: “Qua in re cum considero vitae mortalium conditionem, permultum quidem interesse existimo in rebus humanis, quo maxime aevo quibusque potissimum civitatibus ipsi homines aetatem degant. Imperante enim Caesare Augusto tam prospere tamque feliciter humano generi consultum videri potest, ut nemini dubium sit optimis auspiciis atque consiliis per ea tempora administratum fuisse imperium et omnes artes in summa dignitate Romae claruisse.”

25 Ibid.: “Quo factum est, ut vigente Romani imperii fortuna clarissima ingenia in civitate praestiterint non modo in facultate poetica sed in caeteris omnibus disciplinis, quae honestae ac liberales haberi solent.”

luxuries and unchecked ambition to rule seized men's spirits. The City diminished itself.²⁶

Crinitus can be situated here on a spectrum of Renaissance thinking about history and culture. In one respect, he shares a perspective manifested in Renaissance history-writing from Leonardo Bruni to Machiavelli: cities, Florence included, manifest moments of decline when inhabitants sink into the desire for luxury; symptoms include weakness and susceptibility to invasion accompanied by cultural decadence. At the outset of *De poetis latinis*, in its initial prefatory letter, Crinitus had included praise of Lorenzo de' Medici and his cultural patronage:

Once, Lorenzo de' Medici... was told that there were some in his city who stood out owing to their well-known intelligence and outstanding learning. Upon hearing this, his first emotion was an incredible joy. Then, promising them much and with actions that were as famous as they were generous, he brought it to pass that those who seemed deserving on account of their studies might, ever more energetically and intently, remain alive to the possibility of pursuing and cultivating the highest learning.²⁷

Given the growing cult of the Laurentian age in the Florence of the first decade of the sixteenth century, it would be unsurprising if Crinitus believed that Lorenzo served a similar function for Florence as had Augustus for Rome. Still, his joining political power with literary efflorescence remains potent. Crinitus's comments also remind us that it is helpful to disaggregate modern from Renaissance ideas when it comes to 'republicanism.'²⁸ For Crinitus (as

26 Ibid.: "Sequentibus deinde saeculis posthabita virtute, cum vitia hominum magis aestuant, paulatim respublica delapsa est in partem deteriore et simul fortunae conditio cum moribus immutata est. Itaque luxus et immoderatae libidines civitatem primo invaserunt. Deinceps, ut in magno malo atque licentia accidit, nimia imperandi ambitio cuiusque animos occupavit. Quibus malis impedita ac fatigata civitas non tantum pristinam dignitatem diminuit sed ipsum praeterea imperium pessime affecit."

27 Ibid., prefatory letter: "Laurentius Medices... cum illi relatum foret in civitate sua nonnullos esse, qui praeclaro ingenio ac excellenti eruditione praestarent, primum laetitia incredibili affectus est, deinde multum his pollicendo clareque et munifice agendo effecit, ut et bene meriti viderentur de suis studiis et acrius atque attentius indies pervigilarent in prosequendis atque excolendis optimis disciplinis."

28 A point of entry into the vast literature on this topic can be found in *Renaissance Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections*, ed. James Hankins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

for Bruni and Machiavelli, for that matter) the conceptual opposition between the ancient Roman 'Republic' and 'Empire' was less powerful than the opposition between effective 'power' (however governmentally structured) and decadence. For Crinitus, Roman literary life reached its height during the reign of Augustus.

Crinitus, in the preface to book four, indicates that he has now already treated those who "fulfilled the duty of being a poet with the highest elegance and learning equal to the task."²⁹ Book four begins with Statius and Juvenal. Finally, in the preface to book five, the last book, Crinitus reveals his awareness of decline. He writes: "it remains for me to treat the poets who lived from the time of the Antonines to the Emperors Theodosius and Constantius, though it did not seem part of my project to write about each and every one, once the Empire's greatness had declined and the liberal arts had been abandoned."³⁰ He goes on:

Therefore I must beg the pardon of the learned, if they observe, as they read the following book, that I am including poets who in truth can be considered a bit awkward and inelegant, such as Juvencus, Fortunatus, and others of that sort. In dealing with them, I have tried to conduct myself with a due sense of measure.³¹

His final observation will again ring familiar:

For as religion changed, so too did writers alter poetry's nature and its charm. And indeed, there is no need to wonder at this development, especially since all of Italy was destroyed with great and diverse catastrophes, with many different peoples and barbarous races pulling Italy to pieces. If the elegance and purity of the ancients were destroyed, at

29 Crinitus, *De poetis latinis*, Prefatory letter: "Posteaquam de his poetis, Cosme, Pontifex Arretine, accurate ac diligenter scripsimus, qui summa elegantia parique doctrina hoc munus obierunt, reliquum est, ut de his etiam agamus, qui sequentibus saeculis in hac studiorum facultate ingenium suum excoluerunt."

30 Ibid., Pref. to Book five: "In hoc extremo volumine operis nostri, Cosme, Pontifex Arretine, servatum est a nobis, ut de his poetis ageremus, qui Antoninorum temporibus usque ad Theodosium et Constantios Caesares vixerunt. Neque enim visum est pertinere ad institutum nostrum de omnibus scribere declinata imperii maiestate bonisque artibus magna ex parte destitutis."

31 Ibid.: "Itaque dabunt mihi veniam eruditi homines, qui, cum legent hos libros, videbunt a nobis referri poetas illos, qui re vera paulo ineptiores atque inelegantes haberi possunt, quales sunt Iuvencus, Fortunatus et alii generis eiusdem, in quo moderate me gessi."

the same time ignorance of and inexperience in good literature were on the rise.³²

Thereafter, Crinitus ends on an optimistic note, saying that poetry has been restored somewhat, as one can see from the work of Pontano and Marullus.³³

When Crinitus comes to the accounts of the poets themselves, he follows a strict pattern whose basic parameters are biography and chronology. Poets are not divided up into genres, for example. Crinitus offers the author's name, his regional origins, and some details from his life, setting the author in chronological context by stating the then-reigning consul or consuls as well as any famous contemporaries in the world of oratory. He then discusses the author's known works. Like Angelo Decembrio's *De politia litteraria*, Crinitus's *De poetis latinis* offers an interesting prefiguring of literary aesthetics.³⁴ Crinitus uses certain words ubiquitously: for example, *ingenium* (which usually means something like "talents" or "specific distinguishing gifts") and *elegans* ("elegantly simple," "tastefully economical in poetic choice," "appropriate").³⁵ The book can best be

32 Ibid.: "Nam mutata religione mutarunt etiam indolem atque gratiam carminis. Quocirca minime mirari oportet, praecipue cum universa Italia magnis atque variis cladibus confecta esset distrahentibus eam plurimis populis atque barbaris nationibus, si antiquorum elegantia atque puritas violata est et simul inscitia bonarum litterarum atque imperitia succrevit."

33 Ibid.: "Nostra vero tempestate magnopere debemus laetari, quod ad id accesserunt honestae ac liberales disciplinae, ut aliqua ex parte videantur cum ipsa antiquitate contendere. Quam rem facile probaturi sunt, qui Pontani opera et Marulli paulo attentius perlegerint."

34 See Angelo Decembrio, *De politia litteraria*, ed. Norbert Witten (Munich and Leipzig: Saur, 2002) for an edition; for literature on Decembrio, see Christopher S. Celenza, "Creating Canons in Fifteenth-Century Ferrara: Angelo Decembrio's *De politia litteraria*, 1.10," *Renaissance Quarterly* 57 (2004): 43–98.

35 See for example: "Horace" in *De poetis latinis*, ch. 38, where Horace is described: "Ingenio enim facili et avidissimo fuisse traditur in capiendis optimis disciplinis," i.e., "It is handed down that he possessed a quick and quite insatiable talent for grasping the best branches of learning"; and "Tibullus," ch. 40: "Idem Tibullus libros quattuor Elegiarum sive Amorum composuit, in quibus facile probatur, quam elegans et candidum sit eius Carmen, ut in eiusmodi caloribus describendis latinos omnes videatur superasse cum affectibus exprimendis tum elegantia et suavitate ingenii. Quod ipsum etiam Fabius Quintilianus ad Marcellum victorium refert, cum poetam Tibullum et elegantem imprimis ac tersum existimarit," i.e., "This same Tibullus composed four books of *Elegies* or *Amores*, in which one easily sees how elegant and noble is his poetry, so that, in the way he describes passion he seems to have surpassed all Latin writers both in expressing emotion and in the elegance and agreeableness of his talent. This is something that Fabius Quintilian attests [Quint.,

characterized as a reference book and an attempt to organize what had previously been unsystematic and filled with myths.

It is worth pausing for a moment with Crinitus's principal Renaissance predecessor, the humanist Sicco Polenton (1375/76–1447), who spent much of his career authoring a work on *Illustrious Writers of the Latin Language*, (the *Scriptorum illustrium latinae linguae libri*).³⁶ There Sicco had included three books (II–IV) dedicated to poets. However, he had also treated the origins of the arts and sciences (in book I), Roman magistrates (at the end of book II, otherwise dedicated to poets), as well as historians (V–VIII), writers grouped under the category of “eloquence” (IX–XVI, with seven books, X–XVI, devoted to Cicero alone), Seneca (book XVII), and figures from Quintilian to Boethius (XVIII).

Unlike Sicco, Crinitus covers only authors who made a sizable contribution to poetry. Crinitus also has a vision of antiquity, from Livius Andronicus to Sidonius Apollinaris, whereas Sicco had included Lovato dei Lovati, Dante, Petrarch, and other “moderns.”³⁷ Sicco is concerned more with the lives and historical contexts of the figures about whom he writes, always listing their known works, whereas Crinitus focuses in each *Life* only on those biographical elements that seem directly related to the style and poetic production of the author under consideration.

Their respective *Lives* of Sidonius Apollinaris serve as a useful point of contrast. On the one hand, Sicco relates the political circumstances of Sidonius's life, emphasizing the manner in which a war-ravaged environment induced Sidonius to leave the secular political arena for the ecclesiastical one (as it had his father-in-law Avitus), preferring the comparatively more peaceful life of a bishop.³⁸ On the other hand, Crinitus pays these political circumstances

Inst., 10.1.93], writing to Marcellus Victorius, when he judged that the poet Tibullus was elegant first of all, as well as pure in style.”

36 See Sicco Polenton, *Scriptorum illustrium latinae linguae libri*, ed. Barthold L. Ullman, *Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome* 4 (Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1928).

37 For one representative section, see *ibid.*, 127–39.

38 *Ibid.*, 507–08: “Sequitur hunc Sidonius, vir generosa e familia atque ex primatibus Galliarum. Uxor fuit isti filia Aviti illius ad quem Martiano imperatore occiso fasces imperii populus Romanus, ut restitueret Italiae imperii sedem, misit. Quippe magnum erat Sidonii nomen, magna spes habendi imperii, si consiliis modo fortuna favisset. Sed ardebant omnia bellis, quod magnis undique copiis plurique imperium vi et armis, si iure non possent, arripere conarentur atque sua pro licentia se Caesares appellarent. Denique Avitus cum tenere non posset, et arma et fasces imperii posuit seque, ut viveret tutius, creari Placentinum episcopum impetravit. Sidonius quoque soceri vestigia

almost no mind, focusing more, in his biographical description, on Sidonius's education.³⁹ They differ, too, in the fact that Sicco makes no critical judgment regarding Sidonius's work (except to say that Sidonius was learned and that he possessed a talent for both prose and poetry: . . . *quod vir doctus esset ac dicendi facultatem et prosa et metro haberet*); and then ends with a list of Sidonius's known works. Crinitus, by contrast, writes that Sidonius's prose (as manifested in his *Letters*) "savors of something foreign and Gaulish" (a characteristic Crinitus ties to the general cultural waning accompanying the decline of the

imitatus datum sibi Arvenatem in Gallia praesulatum sumpsit. Id enim utrique visum est tutum esse vitae praesidium nec re alia tueri se ni religionis reverentia et dignitate posse. Imperium autem Leo nominis eius primus obtinuit. Sidonius vero postea Romam ad Theodoricum venit. Erat hic rex Gothorum et datam sibi a Zenone Italiam possidebat. Leonis quidem gener Zeno post socerum imperavit. Sidonius autem, quod vir doctus esset ac dicendi facultatem et prosa et metro haberet, scripsit libros Epistolarum novem, Causarum unum, Sacramentorum unum, Pangericum, hoc est laudum Anthemii Augusti, unum, Pangericum Maiorano Augusto unum, Pangericum Avito imperatori, socero suo, unum, Excusatorium ad Felicem unum, Epithalamium dictum Ruricio et Hibene unum, Epithalamium Polemio et Araricolae unum, Euchariston ad Faustum episcopum unum, Epigramma ad Catulinum unum, Epigrama ad imperatorem Maioranum unum, Epigrammata alia ad diversos quinque, Propenticon ad Librum Suum, Burgum Pontii, Laudes Narbonensis urbis et Civium Eius."

- 39 Crinitus, *De poetis latinis*, "C. Sollius Sidonius Apollinaris" (the final "life"): "C. Sollius Sidonius Apollinaris genere Gallus fuit. Quidam Burdigalensem faciunt; ipse vero de se scribens pluribus locis atque epistolis Arvernum se dicit. Sunt enim Arverni populi finitimi Haeduis inter Celtas constituti. Honestis parentibus et illustri familia ortus est latinisque litteris a prima statim aetate magna diligentia institutus. Nam sub Flavio Nicetio, qui per ea tempora excellens grammaticus habebatur, eruditionem accepit cumque ingenio et industria in prosequendis disciplinis magnopere praestaret. Brevi effecit, ut eos omnes antecederet, qui paribus studiis tenebantur. Permulta scripsit cum soluta oratione tum vario genere carminum; libros novem epistolarum secutus Plinium Secundum, ut ipse refert, etsi tali opere magis ingenium probatur Sidonii quam iudicium, ut qui peregrinum et gallicum redoleat et simul inepta verborum affectatione supra modum laboret. Cuiusmodi accusantur a nostris grammaticis Cassiodorus, Ennodius, Fulgentius et Claudianus Mamertus, qui violata passim ac disiecta Romani imperii dignitate minime servarunt latini sermonis puritatem. Itaque multo maiorem laudem adeptus est ex poematis atque hendecasyllabis, quod in his multum ingenii sit atque elegantiae minime vulgaris. In his quoque panegyricis commendatur, quos Anthemio atque Maioriano dicavit, viris consularibus atque clarissimis. Idem Sidonius magnopere dilexit eruditorum ingenia summisque officiis ac singulari humanitate fovit, ut Lampridium, Tonantium, Tetradium et alios plures; quam rem ipsius epistolae atque epigrammata satis ostendunt. De sacerdotio illius ceterisque dignitatibus nihil dicendum videtur, quod in plerisque aliis omisimus, qui collocati sunt ab antiquis scriptoribus inter christianos poetas."

Roman Empire).⁴⁰ Crinitus continues: "Sidonius, therefore, has garnered much more praise for his poems and hendecasyllable verse, since one finds in them much talent and a level of elegance that is not in the least common. He is also praised for those panegyrics he dedicated to Anthemius and Maiorianus, very famous men of consular rank."⁴¹

As ever with Crinitus, one has the impression both of a governing, standardized theory of how a reference work should be presented, and of what this reference work, specifically, was designed to offer: not an exhaustive catalogue of everything an author wrote, but rather a type of overview of the principal talents of the author under consideration, with the occasional exemplary work mentioned in support of the points made. The comparison is in many ways one of apples and oranges; but that is precisely the point: Sicco's work represented a lifetime of gathering, editing, and compiling, all in the manuscript era, a work repeatedly revised and not quite complete on the author's death. Crinitus, instead, wrote after the fifteenth century's greatest gathering efforts were already accomplished, when intellectuals, if they so chose, could work directly with printers, and at a moment when reference books of all sorts were being theorized and written.⁴² In this respect, one can see in Crinitus a specific manifestation of generational change.

Another way to understand Crinitus's aims, vision, and research methods is to approach his work through manuscripts that document his earlier work. He writes in the preface to *De poetis latinis*, for example, that the work of Pontano and Marullus proves that modern Latin poetry is getting itself on better footing.⁴³ And there is a manuscript in the Biblioteca Laurenziana that offers evidence of Crinitus having gathered and studied portions of Pontano's *Urania*, along with a number of other texts.⁴⁴ Like many manuscripts of this sort, it now exists as a complete book, but its composition reflects the nature of pre-modern graphic culture: separated gatherings and quires were carried about, to be bound only later. The habit, among Poliziano and the members of his circle (one to which Crinitus adhered), was to annotate the texts they studied with a subscription stating the date, place, and circumstances under which they completed their study.⁴⁵ This manuscript is no exception, and there are

40 Ibid., as above, n. 39: "... ut qui peregrinum et gallicum redolet."

41 Ibid., as above, n. 39: "Itaque... clarissimis."

42 See Blair, as above, n. 12.

43 As above, n. 33.

44 MS Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, Plut. 34.50.

45 See Ida Maier, *Les manuscrits d'Ange Politien* (Geneva: Droz, 1965), 13–14, for some examples.

no less than ten separate subscriptions, indicating that Crinitus worked on the texts contained in the manuscript from late 1496 through to August 1499.⁴⁶ Crinitus's epoch was one in which almost all the sources that we now have for the classical era had been gathered. This manuscript and others show us something important: when it came time to make sense of that massive heritage, in the untidy pre-modern graphic world, every possible effort toward being organized was necessary. The polished achievement that *De poetis latinis* represents could not have occurred without this difficult manuscript spadework.

One of the difficulties involved in doing this sort of work had to do with less familiar authors. So it will be helpful in conclusion to return to *De poetis latinis*, with some comments about the final author Crinitus treats, in chapter ninety-five: Sidonius Apollinaris. The account is short and typical in its organization and tone.⁴⁷ Behind it lies a long manuscript containing Sidonius's nine books of letters and his panegyrics. Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, MS Plut. 90, sup. 8 (henceforth cited as "F"), shows every indication of having been pored over attentively by a young Crinitus. The various subscriptions tell us that Crinitus worked on it from October, 1489 to January, 1490 (using the modern dating system), in other words when he was about fifteen years old.

The detailed notes, both marginal and interlinear, that Crinitus inserted into this manuscript offer insight into the everyday working world of a late fifteenth-century scholar. They also show the set of techniques that a young scholar used: a mixture of intense, slow, repetitive reading always complemented by writing. The young Crinitus's notes fall into different categories, and it will be helpful to examine one example of each kind.

The first type can be characterized as lexical highlighting, where Crinitus simply writes in the margin a word unfamiliar to him, to highlight it later: technical terms, musical instruments, and place names often get this type of treatment. For example, in a letter of Sidonius to Agricola, the son of the emperor Avitus (*Ep.1.2*), Sidonius responds to a request of Agricola's for information about the king of the Goths, Theodoric (the Second, r.453–466) regarding the king's habits. Sidonius writes about the King's various routines touching at the end on the habitual *cena regia*, or royal dinner. Sidonius relates the kind of music the King likes to hear and the instruments that are habitually used: normally the king likes only the music of the *fides* (*rege solum illis fidebus delenito*). The King does not care much for the *organa hydraulica*, or other strange instruments (Sid., *Ep.1.2*, ad fin.): *sic tamen quod illic nec organa hydraulica sonant nec sub phonasco vocalium concentus meditatatum acroama simul*

46 Ibid., fols. 65, 76, 83, 85, 96v, 103v, 107v, 109v, 114v, 124v.

47 Text as above, in n. 39.

intonat; nullus ibi lyristes choraules mesochorus tympanistria psaltria cenit . . . Here Crinitus's note is simple. He writes in the margin (F, fol. 3v. mar. sin.): *organa hydraulica, phonascus, Acroama, Mesochorus*, rare words that he wants to learn. This 'highlighting' sort of annotation is by far the most common.

Another lexical sort of note occurs when Crinitus writes a definition of a word in the margin. In another letter, for example, the word *panegyricus* presents itself after a description of Avienus (Sid., *Ep.* 1.9.8). We read in the margin (F., fol. 11v, emphasis here and in the following passage mine):

Panagericum licentiosum et lasciviosum genus dicendi in laudibus regum, in cuius compositione homines multis mendaciis adulantur; quod malum a grecis *exoritur*, quorum levitas, instructa dicendi facultate et copia incredibili, multas mendaciorum nebulas *suscitantur*. Et hinc panegericus dicitur.

Though he does not note it as such, Crinitus is citing Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* here (6.8.7), with which a direct comparison is useful:

Panegyricum est licentiosum et lasciviosum genus dicendi in laudibus regum, in cuius compositione homines multis mendaciis adulantur; quod malum a Graecis *exortum est*, quorum levitas, instructa dicendi facultate et copia incredibili multas mendaciorum nebulas *suscitavit*.

Noteworthy here are the inconsistent way in which Crinitus spells the word *panegyricus* and the odd placement of the passive verb *suscitantur*, where the logic of the sentence would seem to require an active, transitive verb, given the accusative *multas* . . . *nebulas*. We can also note that it is to Isidore (a standard medieval source) that Crinitus turns for information, rather than, say, Quintilian, who also offered definitions of the panegyric genre. (Quint. 2.10.11; 3.4.14.) Soon thereafter we find another citation from Isidore in the margin, this time in the letter to Montius that closes the first book of Sidonius's letters.⁴⁸

Other annotations are more suggestive than definitive. In one letter the topic of Epicureanism comes up, and we find in the margin a prominent capital "N", Crinitus's symbol for *nota*. (*Ep.*, 2.6, to Eutropius; at F, fol. 7v). In another lexical type of note, the text has the word *sphaeristerium* (a kind of

48 F, fols. 12–15v (= Sid., *Ep.*, 1.11), at fo.13v, next to the passage "numerariorum more seu potius advocatorum" (Sid., *Ep.*, 1.11.6) see in mar. sin.: "Numerarii vocati sunt qui publicum nummum erariis inferunt." Cf. Isid., *Etym.*, 9.4.19: "Numerarii vocati sunt, quia publicum nummum aerariis inferunt."

ball court) (Sid., *Ep.*, 2.2.15, at F, fol. 19). Crinitus writes the word in the margin but he writes the “ph” with a Greek *phi* character, something he does elsewhere in the youthful manuscript. In another letter (2.9, to Donidius, at F, fol. 23), Crinitus encounters the word *Nemausum* (a city in *Gallia narbonensis*, today Nîmes), and above the word Crinitus writes *nomen civitatis*. In the same letter we see a correction (ibid.). Crinitus sees the late Latin word *olivitori* (in the phrase *colles aedibus superiores exercentur vinitori et olivitori*); but in the text itself it is misspelled as “ovilitori”, and so in the margin he writes it in its correct form.

There are also annotations with a more historical tone, and often they illuminate exactly the sort of problem on which Crinitus would touch much later in the preface to *De poetis latinis*: chronology. For example, in a brief letter of Sidonius, directed to a relative of his, Apollinaris, Sidonius reports on rumors he heard during the visit of a friend, Thaumastus. Apollinaris was rumored to be giving his support to the emperor Iulius Nepos (who died in 480; his power was shrinking and from 475–80 he ruled from Dalmatia after having been deposed, *de facto*, by those in support of Romulus Augustulus). The key passage runs as follows (Sid., *Ep.*, 5.6.2, at F, fol. 63v):

Namque confirmat [sc. Thaumastus] magistro militum Chilperico, victoriosissimo viro, relatu venenato quorumpiam sceleratorum fuisse secreto insusurratum tuo praecipue machinatu oppidum Vassionense partibus novi principis applicari. [Thaumastus declares that there are some despicable villains who have whispered into the ears of that most victorious leader, Chilperic, the Master of the Soldiers, a poisonous tale, to the effect that the town of Vaison was attaching itself to the party of the new emperor [Iulius Nepos] chiefly owing to your scheming. (tr. W.B. Anderson, slightly modified)]

Who was this Chilperic? We know now, especially because of Sidonius's own dates, that this must have been Chilperic, King of the Burgundians from 473, who was the father of Clotilda, herself the Queen of Clovis, so important for the Christianization of the Franks.⁴⁹ For Crinitus, the situation was different. Here is how Crinitus identifies Chilperic, in the right margin, next to the words *magistro militum Chilperico: scilicet, filio clotharii filii clodovei et patre alterius clotharii*. Crinitus believes that this Chilperic was Chilperic I (538–84), the king of Neustria (or modern-day Soissons). It would seem, too, that Crinitus

49 For background, see Émilienne Demougeot, *La formation de l'Europe et les invasions barbares*, 2 vols. (Paris: Aubier, 1979), II, 2, 649–61.

maintained this basic chronological scheme, given that Sidonius is the last poet treated in *De poetis latinis*, even after Venantius Fortunatus, one of whose hymns Crinitus cites in the margin of this Laurentian manuscript.

To return to the big picture: Crinitus's *De poetis latinis* circulated widely until the eighteenth century; in the sixteenth century alone it went through thirteen different editions. It was popular for a reason: in an era when scholars were increasingly looking for more systematic information, Crinitus provided it for one of the subjects they considered most important. He did so in a way that was as succinct, ordered, and accurate as possible. What seem like slip-ups today with respect to, say, Sidonius Apollinaris's dating, serve only to remind us of the radically different conditions under which Renaissance scholars worked as they struggled to piece together the less documented areas of the ancient world.

Erasmus's Use of George Trapezuntius of Crete in *De conscribendis epistolis*

Peter Mack

One of John Monfasani's "Three Notes on Renaissance Rhetoric,"¹ presented his discovery of two Greek sources (Pseudo-Demetrius and Philostratus 111) for Erasmus's *De conscribendis epistolis*, finding it "interesting to see that at a time when these texts were relatively little read in the Latin West, Erasmus felt a need to refute Greek instruction on epistolography in order to justify his own treatment of the subject" (118). In tribute to John I would like to show how closely Erasmus followed George Trapezuntius of Crete, this time without acknowledgement, in a substantial section of the same work.

We have good evidence that Erasmus had read George Trapezuntius's *Rhetoricorum libri quinque*. In a letter to Gaguin of 1500 he asks to borrow George's *De rhetoricis praeceptionibus*, which must be the same book.² In the letter of 1516 in which he defends the originality of *De copia*, Erasmus calls George "Hermogenis compiler", who promises to write copiously about *copia* but does not deliver (111, 365). The reference can only be to *Rhetoricorum libri quinque*. Any remaining doubt on this question should be removed by the parallel passages quoted below. The passages occur in Erasmus's lengthy discussion of the letter of persuasion, at the point where he begins on the forms of proof suitable for use in letters. He introduces the section in an ambivalent and perhaps disingenuous way:

In the material that follows I advise that you have recourse to the manuals of the rhetoricians, for if I were to try to treat each subject, I should run on too long. I shall merely note down the forms of argumentation that pertain to the rhetorician, for those which Aristotle divided into the three figures are for the most part disregarded even in the schools of the philosophers. I did not find this section in the manuscript copy that I had. On examination I discovered that it had undoubtedly been patched

1 *Rhetorica* 5 (1987): 107–118.

2 Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, ed. Percy Stafford Allen, 12 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906–1958), I, 284. Further reference in the text.

on by someone who had come across it in my papers, excerpted from the precepts of the rhetoricians for some other purpose. But because it might still prove useful on this subject, even if the treatment was inadequate, I did not delete it.³

Erasmus is certainly wrong in suggesting that the teaching of the syllogism was neglected in logic training in the early decades of the sixteenth century. In the second half of the paragraph he appears to claim that the section which follows was inserted into the pirated edition of the work, *Libellus de conscribendis epistolis* (Cambridge: John Siberch, 1521), using a passage from his own notes. This could almost be an admission that the passage in question is not his own since it comes from passages in his notes excerpted from the precepts of the rhetoricians. These passages are in the Siberch edition (sigs E1v–F4v), though the text is different in some small details and in one major way which I shall discuss below.⁴

I shall begin by proving that Erasmus was here copying George by quoting in parallel a lengthy passage in which the two texts are almost identical. George here gives an example of *Ratiocinatio* or syllogistic reasoning, in five parts, in an argument accusing Ulysses of killing Ajax. It seems that George has constructed the example as a sort of mini declamation to show off the rhetorical potential of the structure and Erasmus takes over the example complete. Since *Rhetorica ad Herennium* had taken the same case as its example of ratiocination (11.19.28–30)⁵ it is quite likely that George was

3 "Horum, ut quicque tractandum sit ne sim prolixior, a rhetoribus peti iubebo. Tantum argumentandi formas annotabo, quae rhetori convenient: nam eas quas in tres figuras digessit Aristoteles, magna ex parte frigent, etiam in philosophorum scholis. Quanquam hanc partem non reperi in exemplari, quod apud me fuit manu descriptum. Atque inter recognoscendum plane comperi, hoc ab alio quopiam assutum fuisse, qui nactus sit haec in schedis meis, ex rhetorum praeceptionibus, in alium quempiam usum decerpta. Non reseuimus tamen, quod in his magis desideraremus aptam tractionem quam utilitatem." Erasmus, *De conscribendis epistolis*, ed. Jean-Claude Margolin, in *Opera omnia* 1-2 (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1971), 370, translated by Charles Fantazzi in *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 25 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), 110.

4 Most of the differences involve small changes of words but there are some omissions, for example of this illustration near the end of the section on Simplex Conclusio in the Siberch edition (sig. E2v): "... vitae fuit. Holandus est igitur ebriosus, At Erasmo nihil frugalius. Aut si quod antecedit..." Later editions give another comment and a different example between "fuit" and "aut," *Opera omnia*, 1-2, 373.

5 *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 11.18.28 describes *ratiocinatio* in a somewhat different way from George.

attempting to show his superiority to a text which he had before him throughout his writing of *Rhetoricorum libri quinque*.

Erasmus, *De conscribendis ep.*, pp. 381–2

Omnes homines, iudices, quorum vita per consuetudinem a scelere non abhorret odio sic moventur, ut vehementer exoptent suas inimicitias, quovis explere facinore. Nam eiusmodi homines, qui manus semper iniusto sanguine cruentas habere consueti sunt, quum non possint a vicio animi recedere, non solum quum aut ita accidit ut commodum consequantur, aut incommodum maleficio vitent, moventur ad facinus, verumetiam ipsi causas quaerunt quibus socio iniurias manus adferant. Etenim si boni viri cavendum putant ut ne causam quidem habeant qua praetermittere officium compellantur, hos crudeles viros, hos iniquos, qui semper sanguine gaudent, non mirum est interficiendi hominis causam quaerere. Praeterea, si boni nonnunquam metu, aut inimicitiis a recta via qua semper vixerunt depulsi sunt, quis non credat homines pravos commodum suo moveri ut conservare consuetudinem suam velint? Illi virtutem sibi solitam utilitate decepti omittunt; hi officium quod nunquam observaverunt, quum utilitatem scelere adipisci se posse intelligunt, observabunt? Videlicet ignoratis, iudices, quanta vis sit

George, *Rhetoricorum libri v*, pp. 227–8⁶

Omnes homines, iudices, quorum vita per consuetudinem a scelere non abhorret, odio sic moventur, ut vehementer exoptent, posse suas inimicitias, quovis explere facinore. Nam eiusmodi homines, qui manus semper iniusto sanguine cruentas habere consueti sunt, quum non possint a vitio animi recedere, non solum quum ita accidit ut aut commodum consequantur, aut incommodum maleficio vitent, moventur ad facinus, verumetiam ipsi causas quaerunt quibus socio iniurias manus adferant. Etenim si boni viri cavendum putant ut ne causam quidem habeant qua praetermittere officium impellantur, hos crudeles viros, hos iniquos, qui semper sanguine gaudent, non mirum est interficiendi hominis causas quaerere. Praeterea, si boni nonnunquam metu, aut inimicitiis a recta via, qua semper vixerunt, depulsi sunt: quis non credit homines pravos commodum suo moveri ut conservare consuetudinem suam velint? Illi, sibi virtutem solitam, utilitate decepti, contemnunt; hi officium quod nunquam servaverunt, quum utilitatem ex scelere se adipisci posse intelligunt, tunc observabunt? Videlicet ignoratis, iudices, quanta vis

6 George Trapezuntius, *Rhetoricorum libri quinque*, ed. Luc Deitz (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2006), including a facsimile of the Paris 1538 edition of Christian Wechel.

(cont.)

Erasmus, <i>De conscribendis ep.</i> , pp. 381–2	George, <i>Rhetoricorum libri v</i> , pp. 227–8
<p>irae? quid inimicitiae possint, quid odium pariat? Non dico hic belvas ira et odio moveri, ut alteri noceant? Non dico multos sapientissimos viros, odio atque ira permotos, temperare sibi non potuisse. Praeterire melius est, quot urbes, quot regna, quot gentes infectae odio iacent. Quare iudices, si etiam bonos inimicitiis corrumpi videtis, huiusmodi homines qui per consuetudinem, a maleficio abesse non possunt, odio motos, obtruncare inimicum voluisse dubitatis?</p> <p>At Ulysses acerrimus inimicus, capitalique odio ab Aiace dissidebat. Scitis enim omnes, scitis, nec opus est ut altius rem vobis aperiam, quem in illum animum gessit, post iniquissimam illam contentionem armorum.</p>	<p>irae sit, quid inimicitiae possint, quid odium pariat? Non dico hic belvas ira et odio moveri, ut alteri noceant, non dico multos sapientissimos viros, odio ac ira motos, obtemperare sibi non potuisse. Praeterire melius est, quot urbes, quot regna, quot gentes confectae odio iaceant. Quare iudices, si etiam bonos inimicitiis corrumpi videtis, huiusmodi homines qui per consuetudinem, abesse a maleficio non possunt, odio motos, obtruncare inimicum voluisse dubitatis?</p> <p>At Ulysses acerrimus inimicitiis, capitalique odio ab Aiace dissidebat. Scitis enim omnes, scitis, nec opus est ut altius rem vobis aperiam, quem hic id illum animum gessit, post iniquissimam illam contentionem armorum.</p>

I choose this example as a substantial extract from the longest continuous almost identical passage. There could not be such close coincidence over such a long uninterrupted passage in two texts without direct copying. Erasmus must have copied George here. The next table will show how Erasmus's whole sequence over about 12 pages of the Amsterdam edition copies, makes omissions and additions and keeps returning to George's text.

Erasmus Page.line	Description of Content	George Page.line
370.15	Complexio (Dilemma) Definition	207.27–8
370.15–371.6	Examples of Complexio	Absent
371.6–7	Example of Complexio: Si meministis . . .	208.22–4

Erasmus Page.line	Description of Content	George Page.line
371.7–17	Examples; Faulty Complexio; responses	Absent
371.18–372.2	Example: Accusandus omnino ...	209.12–21 (some omissions)
372.2–6	Irrefutable complexio and example: Non sum ...	209.22–210.2 (some omissions)
372.6–12	Enumeratio Definition and example	210.2–13
372.14–19	Enumeratio second example: Quoniam hunc ...	210.19–26
372.19–23	Replying to Enumeratio	210.15–18 (some changes)
373.1–3	Simplex Conclusio Definition and example	211.3–7
373.3–6	Simplex Conclusio further examples	Absent
373.6–7	Examples of reply to sc: Medea	211.12–14
373.7–11	Further examples of reply	Absent
373.11–13	Reply by denying antecedent	211.10–12
373.14–374.2	Subiectio Definition and example	212.25–213.9
374.2–6	A figure as well as an argument and example	Absent
374.6–8	Replying to Subjectio	215.10–13 (large changes)
Absent	Summissio	215.13–216.24
374.9–10	Oppositio Definition	216.24–6.
374.10–15	Oppositio Example: Si eo tempore ...	Absent
374.17–375.3	Example: Gaius Marius's command	217.3–17
375.3–24	Further examples of Oppositio	Absent
375.25–7	Violatio Definition	220.10–13, 18
376.2–4 (abbreviated)	Violatio Example: marriage and mourning	220.25–221.5 (much longer)
376.5–12	Violatio further examples	Absent
376.13–14	Inductio Definition	221.26–28
376.15–21	Inductio example: Dic mihi ...	222.5–16
376.22–377.4	Inductio further example	Absent
377.5–12	Collectio Definition and five parts	223.18–224.1

(cont.)

Erasmus Page.line	Description of Content	George Page.line
377.13–378.15	Collectio Example: Ulysses and Ajax (one sentence rewritten 378.5–6)	224.2–225.7
378.16–380.6	Collectio further examples	Absent
380.6–7	Three or four parts possible (same idea, different words)	225.24–7
380.8–9	Ratiocinatio Definition	226.1–4
380.10–17	Ratiocinatio in five parts	226.25–227.8
381.1–4	Example of conclusion to Ratiocinatio	227.13–18
381.7–382.18	Example of five-part Ratiocinatio: Ulysses and Ajax (quoted in part above)	227.22–229.19

Book three of *Rhetoricorum libri quinque* is devoted to argumentation. After defining argument and argumentation George outlines ten modes of argumentation used by orators: *complexio*, *enumeratio*, *simplex conclusio*, *subiectio*, *summissio*, *oppositio*, *violatio*, *inductio*, *collectio* and *ratiocinatio* (207). As the table above shows, Erasmus discusses the same forms in the same order as George, except that he omits *summissio* (a form of argument in which the speakers ask themselves the reason why something which they have just said is the case).⁷

Erasmus always follows the definitions given by George, though George himself relies on Cicero for the definitions of *complexio* and *enumeratio*.⁸ For *inductio* and *ratiocinatio*, George and Erasmus give the same definition which is different from Cicero's.⁹ The list of ten topics of person, which Erasmus gives

7 George Trapezuntius, *Rhetoricorum libri quinque*, ed. cit., hereafter George, 215.13–216.24.

8 "Complexio est, in qua utrumvis concesseris, reprehenditur," *De inv.* 1.45, George, 207, Erasmus, *Opera omnia*, 1–2, 370; "Enumeratio est in qua pluribus rebus expositis et caeteris infirmatis, una reliqua necessario confirmatur," *De inv.* 1.45, George, 210, Erasmus, 372. In both cases George provides the genus *argumentatio*, which Cicero and Erasmus omit.

9 "Inductio est argumentatio, quae rebus non dubiis, propter similitudinem, rem quae dubia erat, comprobatur," George, 221, Erasmus, 376; compare *De inv.* 1.51; "Ratiocinatio est argumentatio perfectissima, quae accommodatione assumptionis, ad id quod propositum

a little later in the text is taken from *De inventione*, I. 34. It seems likely that Erasmus had *De inventione*, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* to hand as he composed his text, but it is quite clear that in the discussion of the forms of argumentation, Erasmus takes George as his main source and follows him very closely.

Erasmus usually copies at least one of George's examples but often adds two or three of his own. By the same token (as will be clear from the third column in the table) he usually omits some of George's examples and some of his further discussion of the types of each form of argumentation or of methods of replying to them. As a whole Erasmus's text is simpler in teaching than George's, summarising the main points George about each form of argumentation and giving a range of simple examples.

This point can be understood better by looking at some examples in more detail. In *Complexio*, Erasmus takes comparatively little from George. He copies the definition, which this time, as we have seen, is the same as the young Cicero's, one short example of dilemma, one example of the refutation of a weak dilemma and one example of perfect dilemma. The last two are shortened from George. Of the 60 lines of George's discussion, Erasmus takes over around fifteen. And yet Erasmus produces something rather clear and elegant in a rather short space: a definition; eight clear and short examples; a brief discussion showing how the imperfect dilemma (*complexio depravata*) may be refuted, with two examples; and an explanation that a dilemma founded on contradictory propositions cannot be refuted, with an explanatory example. It is hard to imagine dilemma being treated more effectively. Even though all the doctrines come from George, Erasmus's cuts and his new examples make the strengths and problems of the dilemma much easier to understand.

In *Subiectio*, in which we seem to examine what might be said by our opponent before refuting it point by point, Erasmus provides: a definition; an example which shows how the argument works (both these first two taken from George); the observation that *subiectio* is a figure as well as a form of argumentation, with an explanatory example (both new), and a discussion of ways to reply to *subiectio* (shortened from George). Erasmus omits George's discussions of the similarity between *subiectio* and *enumeratio* and of different ways in which Cicero uses the figure (213.9–215.10). In return he adds something interesting and important, noticing the stylistic use of the figure and thinking

est elicet conclusionem," George, 226, Erasmus, 380; compare *De inv.* 1.57; *argumentatio perfectissima* resembles *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 11.18, which George probably also used for the parts of *rationatio*.

about how argument and elegance fit together. Erasmus's explanation of the two ways to refute *subiectio* is much clearer, though the text of George's work may be corrupt here. Although one might miss George's exploitation of his thorough knowledge of Cicero's speeches, in this case Erasmus seems to give us greater clarity and more doctrine adequately explained in a smaller space.

Violatio is an argument in which we show that our opponent's arguments can be shown to support our conclusion. Erasmus gives: a definition taken from George, in which he embeds the Greek name which George gives later; an example shortened from George but perfectly clear; and three new examples, which make their point very quickly. Again he leaves out explanations of the relationship between this argument and others and the examples which George has taken from Cicero's speeches. Erasmus probably takes over no more than about eight lines from George's 45; his borrowings from George amount to just under half of his whole discussion. But the omissions make the point sharper and the new short examples clarify further the way the argument works and how it might be employed.

In the case of *Inductio*, presented as a bit of a compromise between the Aristotelian and Platonic senses of the word, the same tactics seem to work less well. Erasmus copies the definition and the more important part of the first example from George and adds a new example, but neither example is exactly self-explanatory. Here the further explanation which George gives and Erasmus omits, about the way in which Plato used induction in the dialogues helps the reader understand how the arguments work. From the point of view of letter-writing, in which a dialogue with an opponent is excluded, it might have been better to provide examples focusing more on a series of analogies used to make an argument.

With the five part arguments expressed as *Collectio* and *Ratiocinatio*, Erasmus relies very heavily on George and copies him at length. He borrows the definition and a long example in each case, adding two new examples of *Collectio* and shortening George's comments on the possibilities of a smaller number of parts in each case. Because of the length of the arguments the examples are bound to be long, but Erasmus might have provided greater clarity, and remained closer to his general approach, by composing shorter examples of his own. Erasmus treats these last two forms at much greater length than the others. Together they occupy around seven sixteenths of the whole section.

Erasmus's method of composition here, taking over the definitions and some of the examples from a source, and adding some new examples of his own, is quite normal within the rhetorical textbook tradition. The way in which George Trapezuntius used Hermogenes as a basis for large sections of *Rhetoricorum libri quinque*, adding new Latin examples and long illustrative

quotations from Cicero is exactly parallel.¹⁰ Lucia Calboli Montefusco has shown in great detail how George used his knowledge of a range of Latin rhetorics to construct his account of argumentation.¹¹ She points out that under *complexio* and *enumeratio* George includes additional examples from *Rhetorica ad Herennium* which do not entirely suit the teaching he has taken from *De inventione*.¹² Erasmus includes both these inappropriate examples in the ones he chooses to excerpt from George.¹³

One of George's forms of argumentation highlights a well-known problem in the textual tradition of *De conscribendis epistolis*. The unauthorised Siberch edition of 1521 included *summissio*, the only one of George's ten forms of argumentation omitted in the later authorised text, in a form close to the first half of George's account.

Erasmus, ed. Siberch, sig. E3r–v	George, <i>Rhetoricorum libri v</i> , pp. 215–6
SUBMISSIO est argumentatio, in qua nosmetipsi identidem petimus rationem, quare quidque dicamus.	Summissio est argumentatio, in qua nosmetipsi a nobis petimus rationem quare quidque dicamus, quod genus commode conficietur, si crebro uniuscuiusque rationem petamus, hoc modo: Athenienses magnam philosophiae operam dare voluerunt. Quare sic? Quoniam recte intellexerunt liberales artes summe omnium appetandas esse. Cur ita? Quum per eas efficitur quanto natura hominis reliquis animantibus antecellit,
Exemplum. Veteres illi magnam philosophiae operam dare voluerunt. Quare sic? Quia intellexerunt liberales artes summe omnium appetandas esse. Cur ita? Quum per eas efficitur quanto natura hominis reliquis animantibus antecellit,	

10 Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 39–46; John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 266–89, Lucia Calboli Montefusco, “Ciceronian and Hermogenean Influences on George of Trebizond’s *Rhetoricorum libri v*,” *Rhetorica* 26 (2008): 139–64, and “Les catégories stylistiques du discours dans les *Rhetoricorum libri v* de George de Trébisonde,” in eadem, ed., *Papers on Rhetoric* IX (Rome: Herder, 2008), 165–83.

11 Lucia Calboli Montefusco, “Les formes d’argumentation dans les *Rhetoricorum libri v* de George de Trébisonde,” in *Stylus: la parole dans ses formes. Mélanges en l’honneur du Professeur Jacqueline Dangel* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2010), 263–75. I am grateful to Lucia Montefusco for sending me a copy of this article in advance of publication.

12 Ibid., 265–6; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV.40.52, IV.29.40.

13 *Opera omnia*, I–2, 371 (“Si meministis . . .”), 372 (“Quoniam hunc fundum . . .”).

(cont.)

Erasmus, ed. Siberch, sig. E3r-v

George, *Rhetoricorum libri* v, pp. 215–6

tanto nos indoctis hominibus antecellamus. Cur id? Quia ingenium nostrum, nisi arte doctrinaque excolatur, rude ac omnino suipsius dissimile est. Quare sui dissimile? Quoniam quum eruditus sis, ingenii natura acrior est quam esset si non disciplinis excoleretur. Unde hoc? Quia principia nobis natura quasi semina quaedam imposuit, quae nisi studio germinare feceris, parum profuerit ingenii bonitas. Mirum sic naturam voluisse, recte factum inquam. Quam ob rem? Quoniam voluit nos natura non sine labore, ut caeteras belvas, sed nostro studio, perfici. Huius argumentationis exempla meliora in exornationibus Ciceronis invenies. OPPOSITIO . . .

tanto nos indoctis hominibus antecellamus. Quare hoc? Quia ingenium nostrum, nisi arte doctrinaque excolatur, rude ac omnino sui ipsius dissimile est. Quare sui dissimile? Quoniam cum eruditus sis, natura ingenii multo acutior est quam esset si omni eruditione carere voluisses. Unde hoc? Quia principia quaedam quasi semina natura nobis imposuit, quae nisi cura, studio, labore ac vigilantia germinare feceris, parum ingenii bonitate frui. Mirum quod sic natura factum sit. Recte factum inquam. Quamobrem? Quoniam voluit nos non ut belvas sine labore perfici, sed industria et opera nostra aeternitatem mereri. Haec argumentatio et auditores facile . . .

In this extract Erasmus takes over from George both the definition, which George has taken from *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV.16.23, and his long original example.¹⁴ The clue to the later omission may lie in the last sentence of the entry in the Siberch edition. On reflection Erasmus may have decided that *Submissio* was better regarded as a figure of thought than as a form of argumentation. This change confirms, if further proof were needed, that Erasmus had George's work before him as he composed this section of the text and that he thought carefully about what to include and what to omit, even to the extent of changing his mind about one of George's forms of argumentation.

Erasmus's adaptation of George is anything but casual. It is clearly deliberate, thoughtful and acute. Erasmus knowingly set about making George's treatment of the forms of argumentation sharper and more effective in teaching.

14 Montefusco, "Les formes," 267.

But one might also ask how many of these forms would really be appropriate in a letter. Several of them seem to depend on the presence of an adversary to whom one pretends to offer questions, concessions or alternatives.

Every time I read Erasmus's *De conscribendis epistolis* I find more to admire in it. Erasmus has concentrated immense knowledge of rhetoric and considerable thought about literary examples and the principles of persuasion into a remarkably focused teaching of an eminently practical skill. Reading this text one almost agrees with Lawrence Green's observation that the letter-writing manual could contain most of the rhetoric which a sixteenth-century person would need.¹⁵ This paper has argued that one portion of the work is a highly intelligent abridgement and adaptation of a passage from George Trapezuntius's *Rhetoricorum libri quinque*. Since Erasmus himself does not acknowledge this, it is only just that we should add to his titles, admiringly rather than bitterly, "Trapezuntii compiler." And that is a title which Erasmus will have to share with John Monfasani.

15 Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, 90–96, 228, 245–6.

PART 2

Essays



The Byzantine Social Elite and the Market Economy, Eleventh to Mid-Fifteenth Century

David Jacoby

This essay questions some common views regarding the approach of the Byzantine social elite toward the market economy in the period extending from the eleventh to the mid-fifteenth century.¹ The elite in that period may be broadly defined as divided between court and provincial elites. Individuals enjoying proximity to the emperor benefited from his patronage and favors: they received appointments to high positions at the imperial court and in the provinces, as well as various grants. Some of them are known to have owned large landed estates in the provinces. At the highest levels of the elite, however, income from the state weighed more heavily than land, at least until the second half of the eleventh century. Land became increasingly important over time, especially after the 1080s, when imperial grants in cash and silks were abolished. The power base and authority of the provincial *archontes*, distinct from the group attached to the imperial court, was local or regional and depended more on land.²

Until quite recently it was widely believed that the Byzantine elite not only professed, but also practiced self-sufficiency as a virtue, abstained from trade, was reluctant to engage in economic enterprises, and was contemptuous of profit until well into the Palaiologan period. Regardless of their social origin, most Byzantine authors of the eleventh–fourteenth centuries, who were tightly connected to and mostly dependent upon the elite, expressed these values and attitudes and identified with them. Their references to traders are clouded by social prejudice, cultural stereotypes, and literary conventions.

-
- 1 In order to shorten the notes I mainly cite recent studies in which the reader will find a more extensive bibliography.
 - 2 Peter Frankopan, “Land and Power in the Middle and Later Period,” in *The Social History of Byzantium*, ed. John Haldon (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 122–127; on imperial grants and their abolition: Nicolas Oikonomides, “The Role of the Byzantine State in the Economy,” in *The Economic History of Byzantium from the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Angeliki E. Laiou (Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 2002) (hereafter: *EHB*), III, 1010–1011, 1014, 1041–1048.

Trade, they claim, is a lowly occupation involving lying and cheating, which does not befit respectable men.³ On the whole, these views were supported by the normative statements of ecclesiastical sources.⁴ In the wake of Roman law, Byzantine imperial legislation from the sixth century onward considered dignities as incompatible with trade.⁵ Recent studies offer a different perspective. They stress that self-sufficiency relying exclusively on land was an unrealistic ideological and literary construct, and that the literary sources did not reflect the realities on the ground. Moreover, the pursuit of profit from mercantile enterprise was considered acceptable, justified, and legitimate.⁶

Based on documentary and material evidence, there is now a consensus that accelerated demographic growth, increased urbanization, and economic expansion took place in the empire from the late tenth through the twelfth century. Large landowners, both laymen and ecclesiastical institutions, strove to enlarge their rural property and workforce in order to increase the exploitation of their landed estates by dependent peasants, who leased or sharecropped it. They promoted land clearance and invested limited resources to raise productivity, as by irrigation projects. On the whole, though, Byzantine agriculture remained static in terms of farming methods, technology and productivity. Agricultural improvements were mainly aimed at an increase in total production, rather than at a more efficient exploitation.⁷ The growth of market demand made land more valuable, since supply remained constant. In other words, the consolidation of landownership was driven by the quest of greater returns, rather than by commercial factors.⁸ The Constantinopolitan elite landlords used the agricultural and pastoral produce of their scattered provincial estates for self-supply, or else sold it as close as possible to these estates to save transportation costs. The great provincial landlords also sold their surpluses to

3 David Jacoby, "The Byzantine Outsider in Trade (c.900-c.1350)," in *Strangers to Themselves: The Byzantine Outsider*, ed. Dion C. Smythe (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 129–130, repr. in David Jacoby, *Latins, Greeks and Muslims: Encounters in the Eastern Mediterranean, Tenth–Fifteenth Centuries* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), no. 1; John Haldon, "Social Elites, Wealth and Power," in Haldon, *The Social History of Byzantium*, 197.

4 See Angeliki E. Laiou, "Economic Thought and Ideology," in *EHB*, 3: 1125–1128.

5 Maria Gerolymatou, "L'aristocratie et le commerce (IX^e–XI^e siècles)," *Byzantina Symmeikta* 15 (2008): 77–78.

6 Laiou, "Economic Thought and Ideology," 1128–1136; Angeliki E. Laiou and Cécile Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 160–163.

7 *Ibid.*, 90–113.

8 Frankopan, "Land and Power," 130–131; Laiou and Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy*, 98–100.

yield cash.⁹ The enhanced resources of the elite were mainly directed toward conspicuous consumption.

The present paper challenges the view that the Byzantine elite maintained a static approach to the exploitation of rural resources and to the production of surpluses in the period extending from the eleventh to the mid-fifteenth century. It contends that members of the elite shared a market-oriented approach in that period. This approach may be defined as awareness to market demand for specific commodities and, in response to that demand, active intervention to increase, improve or hasten production in their estates, the conversion of raw materials into finished products, and marketing. In other words, these individuals actively furthered the exploitation of their estates because they were directly involved in the market economy. The quantitative increase in production without qualitative growth did not contradict a conscious market-oriented approach.

The provisioning of Constantinople, which is better documented than the supply of other cities, offers some indirect evidence in that respect. Modern estimates of the city's population in the eleventh and twelfth century remain in the realm of speculation, in the absence of reliable figures in medieval sources. However, based on circumstantial evidence, there is good reason to believe that the city enjoyed a sizeable demographic growth in that period.¹⁰ Constantinople was particularly attractive to people searching employment or business opportunities in view of its large population, the various functions of state institutions, the vast economic resources flowing to the city, and the latter's centrality in the Byzantine supply system. A large influx of "aliens, Armenians and Arabs and Jews" in the first decades of the eleventh century was held responsible for the severe riots that erupted in Constantinople in 1044, which prompted emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (r. 1042–1055) to

9 Paul Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 160–171; Paul Magdalino, "The Grain Supply of Constantinople, Ninth-Twelfth Centuries," in *Constantinople and its Hinterland. Papers from the Twenty-Seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, April 1993*, eds. Cyril Mango and Gilbert Dagron (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1995), 37–39, repr. in Paul Magdalino, *Studies in the History and Topography of Byzantine Constantinople* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), no. IX.

10 Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 121 and n. 49, with reference to a study of mine, as though I accepted the figure of 400,000 stated by Geoffroy of Villehardouin, a French knight who participated in the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204; Magdalino, "The Grain Supply of Constantinople," 35–36, cites the figure as a "global estimate," and Laiou and Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy*, 131, as if it were a fact. However, it is merely an impressionistic assessment of a medieval observer who, like many others, is prone to exaggeration.

order the expulsion of all those among them who had settled in the city in the preceding thirty years.¹¹ The population growth was obviously not limited to these ethnic groups and continued throughout the eleventh century. The resulting increase in grain demand may account for the short-lived attempt of Emperor Michael VII Doukas (r. 1071–1078) to channel the grain trade from Rhaidestos to Constantinople through an imperial market, in order to take advantage of its growing volume and tax it more efficiently.¹² Building activity on vacant land, often mentioned in the 1180s, also suggest expanding population and economic growth.¹³

The accumulation of wealth and the rise in purchasing power in Constantinople resulted in changing consumption patterns and a greater inclination to display luxury in food, dress and other spheres of life.¹⁴ This process fueled a growing and increasingly diversified demand, which was no more limited to the elite. The admission to the Senate of rich merchants and senior members of the guilds as well as some administrative personnel, a policy enhanced by Constantine IX Monomachos and apparently pursued until the accession of Alexios I Komnenos to the throne in 1081, has generally been considered in a political, social or fiscal perspective.¹⁵ It reflects the pressure of individuals not belonging to the elite eager to translate their increased economic resources, which are the main consideration here, into enhanced social status.

The growing and more diversified demand for costly commodities in Constantinople was met by the import of surpluses from the provinces,

11 See David Jacoby, "The Jews of Constantinople and their Demographic Hinterland," in *Constantinople and its Hinterland*, 223–225, repr. in David Jacoby, *Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), no. IV.

12 Magdalino, "The Grain Supply of Constantinople," 39–45; Laiou, "Exchange and Trade, Seventh–Twelfth Centuries," in *EHB*, 2: 741–744, and in Laiou and Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy*, 135–136, differs in her interpretation and rightly insists upon the fiscal aspect of the attempt.

13 Magdalino, "The Grain Supply of Constantinople," 35–36; Paul Magdalino, "The Maritime Neighborhoods of Constantinople: Commercial and Residential Functions, Sixth to Twelve Centuries," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 54 (2001): 209–226, repr. in Magdalino, *Studies*, no. III; Chryssa Maltezou, "Les Italiens propriétaires 'terrarum et casarum' à Byzance," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 22 (1966): 181–186, 189.

14 Aleksandr Kazhdan and Ann W. Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 74–83.

15 J.-C. Cheynet, 'Le rôle de la "bourgeoisie" constantinopolitaine: XI^e–XII^e siècle', *Zbornik radova Vizantoloskog Instituta*, 46 (2009), 89–106. See also below.

including distant ones. The production of pastoral and agricultural commodities such as cheese, oil, and wine, as well as the weaving of silks in the provinces of the empire was largely geared to the supply of the capital. Between 1183 and 1185 the metropolitan of Athens, Michael Choniates, reminded the citizens of Constantinople that the provinces were feeding them and that “Theban and Corinthian fingers” wove their garments.¹⁶ The consumption of choice caviar in Constantinople, yet another aspect of luxury display, is attested in the twelfth century yet must have begun earlier.¹⁷ In short, both the quantitative and qualitative demand for commodities in Constantinople was on the rise from the early eleventh century at the latest.

Cretan cheese was clearly an export-oriented commodity by that time. A consignment weighing 2,860 kg was shipped to Constantinople in 1022. Cretan cheese was also directed toward foreign markets, the demand of which must have further stimulated the production of surpluses. Exports of agricultural and pastoral products to Egypt were well underway by the 1060s or 1070s, when they are first attested, and continued in the twelfth century.¹⁸ We have no direct information regarding the involvement of large landlords in their production and marketing at that time, although this was likely the case considering later sources examined below.

The handling of olive oil provides some indirect evidence regarding the relation of the Byzantine provincial elite to rural production and the market economy. Especially high-grade oil was a fairly expensive commodity in the Middle Ages.¹⁹ Oil from Apulia in southern Italy was being shipped to Constantinople by the mid-eleventh century, and this was possibly still the case by the 1080s, after Byzantium’s loss of that region. However, by the twelfth century the

16 Foteini Kolovou, ed., *Michaelis Choniatae Epistulae* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, xLI) (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 69–70, epist. 50.

17 David Jacoby, “Caviar Trading in Byzantium,” in Rustam Shukurov, ed., *MARE ET LITORA. Essays presented to Sergei Karpov for his 60th Birthday* (Moscow: Indrik, 2009), 349–351.

18 David Jacoby, “Byzantine Crete in the Navigation and Trade Networks of Venice and Genoa,” in Laura Balletto, ed., *Oriente e Occidente tra medioevo ed età moderna. Studi in onore di Geo Pistarino* (Università degli Studi di Genova, Sede di Acqui Terme, Collana di Fonti e Studi, 1.1) (Acqui Terme: Brigati Glauco, 1997), 521–522, 525–529, 536, repr. in Jacoby, *Byzantium*, no. 11.

19 David Jacoby, “Rural Exploitation and Market Economy in the Late Medieval Peloponnese,” in Sharon J. Gerstel, ed., *Viewing the Morea: Land and People in the Late Medieval Peloponnese* (Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 2012), 238, 242 (in press).

Peloponnese had apparently become one of the main suppliers of oil to the capital.²⁰

Literary and archeological evidence reveals that in the late tenth and the eleventh century Sparta processed olives from its countryside in presses located in the city and functioned as regional oil market and distribution center.²¹ Oil exports from the Peloponnese appear to have been routine by 1134, when two consignments were shipped to Egypt.²² A Venetian charter records *archontes* residing in Sparta jointly selling oil to Venetian merchants in 1147 or 1148 for export to Constantinople.²³ This joint sale deserves special attention. The *archontes* were surely among the major landowners in the countryside of Sparta, while holding a dominant position in the city. It is likely that their estates grew olive trees and that they owned oil-presses in Sparta, like their late tenth-century predecessors, or else in their estates, like large landlords of the Byzantine and Frankish Peloponnese in the thirteenth and fourteenth century.²⁴ As *archontes* they wielded power and authority in the region in which they were based,²⁵ and obviously over the *paroikoi* or dependent peasants of their estates. Although not grounded in legal or administrative authority, they could exert economic pressure and compel their peasants to use their oil-presses in return for payment.²⁶ In addition, as suggested by later evidence that will soon be examined, they presumably bought oil or olives from them. In short, it is likely that they handled oil both from their own domain and from their peasants.

20 David Jacoby, "Venetian Commercial Expansion in the Eastern Mediterranean, 8th–11th centuries," in Marlia Mundell Mango, ed., *Byzantine Trade, 4th–12th Centuries. The Archaeology of Local, Regional and International Exchange* (Papers of the Thirty-eight Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, St. John's College, University of Oxford, March 2004) (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 378–379.

21 Jacoby, "Rural Exploitation," 233–234.

22 Raimondo Morozzo della Rocca – Antonino Lombardo, eds., *Documenti del commercio veneziano nei secoli XI–XIII* (Turin: Editrice Libreria Italiana, 1940), I, 69, no. 65.

23 Antonino Lombardo e Raimondo Morozzo della Rocca, eds., *Nuovi documenti del commercio veneto dei sec. XI–XIII* (Venice: Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, 1953), 14, no. 11, issued in 1151, yet with reference to the expedition of King Roger II of Sicily to Greece in 1147; also *ibid.*, 11, no. 9, drafted in 1150.

24 Jacoby, "Rural Exploitation," 234–236.

25 Haldon, "Social Elites," 190–191.

26 A similar pattern is attested for the use of the landowners' mills. Indeed, contrary to Laiou and Morriison, *The Byzantine Economy*, 99–100, there is evidence suggesting a monopoly of Byzantine landlords on mills: Jacoby, "Rural Exploitation," 246–248. The peasants also used the landlords' silk processing equipment and installations: see below.

There was also an economic rationale favoring the concentration of oil in the hands of the *archontes*. Wholesale transactions were clearly more convenient for merchants than direct purchases of small quantities from individual peasants, despite added cost. These transactions also offered an advantage to small producers, despite the loss of some income, since they relieved them from transportation to a market and from the search of a buyer for their oil. It is likely, therefore, that the wholesale of oil by local *archontes* attested in 1147 or 1148 was the rule. The joint sale practiced by the *archontes* enabled them to negotiate from a position of strength with potential customers and implies a clear understanding of market mechanisms.

The role of the *archontes* of Sparta as middlemen handling large consignments of oil, in response to market demand, implies that they had a vested interest in the expansion of olive growing both on their own domain and on the peasants' land, and that they encouraged the plantation of trees. It may be safely assumed that their market-oriented approach was shared by their peasants. It must have reflected the mentality of many large landowners throughout the empire in the twelfth century, and presumably also earlier in the eleventh.²⁷ As we shall see below, it extended to rural products other than oil.

The function of the provincial *archontes* as middlemen and wholesalers handling their own oil as well as produce obtained or acquired from their peasants in the twelfth century is supported by evidence from the Frankish Peloponnese and Venetian Crete in the fourteenth century. The use of this late evidence may lead to anachronistic backward projections, unless carefully handled. It is justified, though, by the large degree of continuity in rural exploitation by the peasants themselves in their household holdings and on domain land held by the landlords, by agricultural and pastoral contracts associating peasant and landowner, as well as by fiscal and legal practice and terminology in the Byzantine territories conquered by the Latins in the early thirteenth century. These features of rural exploitation were only marginally affected by the transition from Byzantine to Frankish or Venetian rule and the replacement of Byzantine by Frankish or Venetian landlords, respectively, or by changes in the destination of surpluses.

The continuity of Byzantine practices is illustrated in the exploitation of large estates in the Frankish Peloponnese, especially well documented by several surveys and reports. However, these documents, though modeled after the Byzantine *praktika*, which are *fiscal* censuses, were compiled to assess or determine the revenue accruing from *economic* exploitation and, therefore,

27 Strangely, Laiou refers to market-oriented activities of peasants, yet fails to mention the large landlords' similar approach: Laiou and Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy*, 111.

reflect more accurately economic realities. Venetian contracts mainly illustrate another aspect of the attitude of large landowners to the market economy, since they provide important insights into the commercialization of rural produce.²⁸

The pattern of cheese commercialization in Venetian Crete is especially relevant to the function of twelfth-century Byzantine *archontes* as wholesalers of rural produce. Indeed, around 1280 landlords in the region of Sitia, in eastern Crete, often sold the cheese they bought from their Greek villeins or dependent peasants, in addition to the produce from their own flock. A fiefholder promised storage for the cheese he was to deliver, the price being similar to that paid by other fiefholders of the area to their villeins. Similar deals are attested in 1300 and 1306.²⁹ It is likely that the large consignment of cheese shipped to Constantinople in 1022, mentioned earlier, was also assembled and sold by one large landowner or jointly by several of them.

The dynamism of provincial landlords who took a direct interest in the production and marketing of surpluses has been contrasted to the *rentiers* mentality of high-ranking members of the Constantinopolitan elite living off the proceeds of distant estates.³⁰ This sweeping generalization is hardly convincing. The instructions given by the lay founders of large monasteries regarding domain management, accounting, and the commercialization of surpluses, as well as regarding the implementation of the relevant measures illustrate awareness of profitable investments in land exploitation, vivid interest in the market economy, and economic acumen shared by large lay and ecclesiastical landlords, regardless of their place of residence.³¹ Some Constantinopolitan

28 For the last two paragraphs, see David Jacoby, "Changing Economic Patterns in Latin Romania: The Impact of the West," in Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh, eds., *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World* (Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 2001), 198–200, 212–217, repr. in David Jacoby, *Commercial Exchange across the Mediterranean: Byzantium, the Crusader Levant, Egypt and Italy* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), no. IX.

29 David Jacoby, "Cretan Cheese: A Neglected Aspect of Venetian Medieval Trade," in Ellen E. Kittel and Thomas F. Madden, eds., *Medieval and Renaissance Venice* (Urbana IN: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 52–53, repr. in Jacoby, *Commercial Exchange*, no. VIII.

30 Magdalino, "The Grain Supply of Constantinople," 46.

31 On domain management and accounting, see Jacques Lefort, "The Rural Economy, Seventh-Twelfth Centuries," in *EHB*, 1: 295–299; Kostis Smyrlis, *La fortune des grands monastères byzantins (fin du x^e–milieu du xiv^e siècle)* (Paris: Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance. Monographies 21, 2006); Michel Kaplan, "L'économie du monastère de la Kosmosôteira fondé par Isaac Comnène d'après le *typikon* (1152)," *Travaux et Mémoires* 16 (2010) = *Mélanges Cécile Morrisson*: 469–480.

landlords went in person to supervise the harvest on their land.³² Although living far from some of their estates, they were keen to obtain the largest possible income from them, appointed managers whom they could trust to that effect, provided them with instructions, and controlled the accounts. Not surprisingly, therefore, some eleventh and twelfth century imperial officers and estate managers took advantage of their position and the means passing through their hands to engage in profitable private trading and transportation ventures.³³ Some monasteries of Mount Athos owning large estates shipped their surpluses as far as Constantinople.³⁴ From the eleventh century onward the monastery of Ganos, close to the Sea of Marmara, combined the production of wine and the ceramic containers for its shipping to an extensive region. Ganos was continuing to produce abundant wine, the main source of its revenue, by the early fourteenth century.³⁵ This was clearly a large market-oriented enterprise. There is no reason to doubt that lay landlords acted likewise. They were driven by the same profit-making motivation as other strata and groups of society, including the clergy.

It has been claimed that land was especially valuable when situated at a short distance from Constantinople or close to secondary markets and to transport routes allowing easy shipping of rural produce to Constantinople.³⁶ The argument overlooks the importance of market demand for specific commodities, the production and quality of which was primarily conditioned by soil, climate, and processing. The high-grade oil from Sparta was exported by sea, despite the arduous crossing of mountainous regions to maritime outlets.³⁷ It has been persuasively argued that the imperial policy regarding grain trade and export after 1261 responded to the interests of large

32 Magdalino, "The Grain Supply," 39.

33 See Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 144, 170.

34 Smyrlis, *La fortune des grands monastères*, 106–116, 219–234; Peter Soustal, "Wirtschaft und Handelsleben auf dem Heiligen Berg Athos," in Ewald Kislinger, Johannes Koder, Andreas Külzer, eds., *Handels Güter und Verkehrswege. Aspekte der Warenversorgung im östlichen Mittelmeerraum (4. bis 15. Jahrhundert)* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 388, 2010), 275–287.

35 Nergis Günsenin, "Ganos Wine and its Circulation in the 11th century," in Mango, *Byzantine Trade*, 145–153; Nergis Günsenin, "A 13th-Century Wine Carrier: Çamalti Burnu, Turkey," in George F. Bass, ed., *Beneath the Seven Seas. Adventures with the Institute of Nautical Archeology*. (London: Thames and Hudson, 2005), 118–123; David Jacoby, "Mediterranean Food and Wine for Constantinople: The Long-Distance Trade, Eleventh to Mid-Fifteenth Century," in Kislinger, Koder, Külzer, *Handels Güter und Verkehrswege*, 135.

36 Frankopan, "Land and Power," 125.

37 Jacoby, "Rural Exploitation," 235.

landholders.³⁸ Yet such landlords must have also been attentive and responsive to market demand at an earlier period. It is likely, therefore, that already by the early eleventh century the great provincial landlords perceived the changing consumption patterns and the widening and more diversified demand among the Byzantine elite and, beyond its ranks, among the middle stratum of Byzantine society. They must have been aware of the benefit to be gained from a market-oriented exploitation of their estates, including the function of wholesalers in that framework, and have acted to maximize their profits.

The development of the silk industry in western Byzantium from the eleventh century onward reflects another aspect of market-oriented approach and activity among the empire's elite. Although not directly attested, there is good reason to believe that *archontes*, members of the local elite living in provincial cities, were the driving force behind the launching and promotion of silk manufacturing in Thebes, Corinth, as well as in the islands of Euboea and Andros in the Aegean.³⁹ This development was stimulated by the growing demand for high-grade silk textiles, both among the elite and beyond its ranks within the empire and especially in Constantinople.⁴⁰

The rearing of silk worms was exclusively carried out by peasant households, yet the silk yields were small. As revealed by testimonies recorded in 1328 in the Venetian Peloponnese, they reached from 10 to 25 light pounds of cocoons. Once dried, these yielded only 20 percent properly reeled silk, thus between 2 and 5 light pounds of 343 grams or between 686 and 1,715 grams

38 Angeliki E. Laiou, "In the Medieval Balkans: Economic Pressures and Conflicts in the Fourteenth Century," in Speros Vryonis Jr., ed., *Byzantine Studies in Honor of Milton V. Anastos* (Byzantine kai Metabyzantina, IV) (Malibu, Calif.: Undena Publications, 1985), 140, repr. in Angeliki E. Laiou, *Gender, Society and Economic Life in Byzantium* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1992), no. IX.

39 David Jacoby, "Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 84/85 (1991/1992): 452–500, repr. in David Jacoby, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), no. VII; David Jacoby, "Silk in Mediaeval Andros," in Evangelos Chrysos and Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, eds, *Captain and Scholar. Papers in Memory of Demetrios I. Polemis* (Andros: Kaïreios Vivliothēkē, 2009), 137–150. A dowry provided in the South-Italian city of Gaeta in 1103 mentions a piece of clothing made of sendal from Andros, which implies that silk manufacturing began in the island in the eleventh century: *Tabularium Casinense, Codex diplomaticus Cajetanus* (Montecassino: Typis Archicœnobii Montis Casini, 1887–1891), 2: 164, no. 275.

40 See the quote from Michael Choniates regarding the supply of cloth to Constantinople, above, 71.

respectively.⁴¹ The economic rationale governing the sale of oil must have also determined the sale pattern of raw silk, namely concentration of small individual amounts produced by peasants in the hands of large landowners on whose estates they resided. The *archontes* had first and direct access to these peasants. They could compel them to use their installations for the rearing of cocoons and the reeling of silk, in return for payments partly made in silk. It is likely that this practice, recorded in the fourteenth-century Frankish Peloponnese, had been inherited from the pre-1204 Byzantine period.⁴² The landlords also had the means to buy silk from their peasants, to invest capital in the infrastructure of the industry, and to finance its operation by supplying it continuously with raw materials and with liquid capital for the latter's purchase and the payment of the workers' wages. This would not have been surprising, since provincial *archontes* and other members of the elite are known to have lent money for various purposes, including trade.⁴³ Those promoting silk manufacture acted as entrepreneurs, employers of silk weavers, or associates of independent craftsmen. In return, they received finished products, which they sold to Byzantine or foreign merchants.⁴⁴ In short, some provincial *archontes* responded to market demand in an economic sector located beyond the framework of their estates, yet firmly anchored in the latter's produce. It is unlikely that merchants could compete with the *archontes* in the financing of silk manufacturing in western Byzantium before 1204.⁴⁵ They presumably dealt with the marketing and export of silk textiles, rather than with raw silk.

The role of large landowners in the concentration of raw silk is attested at a later period in the Peloponnese, although by that time the region's silk

41 David Jacoby, "Silk Production in the Frankish Peloponnese: the Evidence of Fourteenth Century Surveys and Reports," in Haris A. Kalligas, ed., *Travellers and Officials in the Peloponnese. Descriptions – Reports – Statistics, in Honour of Sir Steven Runciman* (Monemvasia: Monemvasiōtikos Homilos, 1994), 52, 55, n. 52 (on the pound of Modon, used for raw silk), 57, repr. in Jacoby, *Trade*, no. VIII.

42 Ibid., 51–53, 57.

43 Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 156; Laiou and Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy*, 140–141.

44 Jacoby, "Silk in Western Byzantium," 460–461, 464, 466–468, 477–480, 491–498.

45 Laiou in Laiou and Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy*, 129, considers merchants as likely investors in silk manufacturing, yet fails to take into account the factors mentioned here. Conditions changed after 1204, when the Frankish conquest reduced the wealth and power of the Greek *archontes* who remained in the region and western merchants replaced them as promoters: see David Jacoby, "Les Génois dans le duché d'Athènes au XIII^e siècle," in *Tous azimuts. Mélanges de recherches en l'honneur du Professeur Georges Jehel = Histoire Médiévale et Archéologie Université de Picardie*, 13 (2002): 267–273.

was largely being exported to Italy.⁴⁶ In 1296 an *archon* from the Byzantine Peloponnese sold silk at an annual fair held in Frankish Morea. Only a large volume would have warranted his attendance at that gathering. In 1381 John Laskaris Kalopheros, a Byzantine adventurer wedded to a daughter of Erard III Le Maure, one of the most powerful barons of Frankish Morea, sold two silk consignments totaling 2,773 light pounds of Modon or some 951 kilograms to several foreign merchants.⁴⁷ At an average yield of 3.5 pounds per peasant this quantity represented 792 peasant households, thus the yield of several villages.⁴⁸

It has been argued that emperors, members of the elite, and Byzantine authors displayed a new attitude toward merchants, caring for their well-being and defending their interests against Italian competitors, from the late thirteenth and especially in the fourteenth century.⁴⁹ This was followed by the involvement of a group within the Constantinopolitan élite itself in the mercantile economy, which will be examined below.

The contention that the Byzantine elite was adverse to trade and merchants until the late thirteenth century, still fairly widespread in the scholarly community, has tainted various interpretations of earlier sources. Scholars have been reluctant to admit that despite the conservative economic ideology shared by members of the Byzantine elite, some of them were involved in economic pursuits well before that period. Emperor Theophilos (r. 829–842) discovered that his wife Theodora had imported precious goods from Syria on a ship she owned. The emperor strongly condemned her involvement in trade and ordered the ship with the goods on board to be burned.⁵⁰ The case has been considered a confirmation of the elite's social ethos. However, Theodora's ownership of the vessel implies that the documented commercial sailing to Syria was not a one-time venture. Some time after 937 the governor of Egypt, Muhammad bin Tughdj Al-Ikhshid, referred in a letter to the sale of goods that Emperor Romanos I Lekapenos (r. 920–944) had sent with his ambassadors to Egypt, obviously to finance the purchase of some commodities.⁵¹

46 Jacoby, "Silk Production," 44–48, 59–61.

47 Ibid., 45, 55, 60.

48 For this hypothetical calculation I have adopted an average based upon the yields mentioned above, 76–77.

49 Angeliki E. Laiou, "Monopoly and Privilege: the Byzantine Reaction to the Genoese Presence in the Black Sea," in Balletto, *Oriente e Occidente*, 679–683.

50 There are several versions of the case, discussed by Gerolymatou, "L'aristocratie et le commerce," 81–84.

51 Alexandre A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes: 2. Extraits des sources de Byzance et des Arabes II La dynastie macédonienne (867–959)*, (Brussels: Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales, 1950. Corpus Bruxellense Historiae Byzantinae, 2/2), 213.

The *Book of the Eparch*, compiled in the early tenth century for Constantinople, reveals that imperial dignitaries and powerful men in the city invested capital and used servants, slaves and guild members as straw men and proxies to infiltrate the guilds of silk garment merchants, raw silk merchants, silk yarn producers and silk cloth manufacturers. As a result they could participate in the collective purchase of imported raw silk, in the manufacture of silk textiles, and in the sale of silk cloth.⁵² However, the involvement of members among the Constantinopolitan elite in silk manufacture and trade differed from that of the provincial *archontes* at a later period, since it was not directly based on the produce of their rural estates. Moreover, they integrated within an existing production and marketing system without promoting it and, therefore, cannot be credited with a market-oriented approach. The market for silks was anyhow fairly limited at that time, and only expanded by the early eleventh century as a result of growing demand, as noted above.

Emperor Alexios I strongly objected to the senatorial rank obtained before his reign by individuals not belonging to the empire's elite.⁵³ The 'aristocratic' Comnenian regime is considered to have adhered to the elite's professed ethos and anti-mercantile stand.⁵⁴ However, one should not mistake the opposition of Alexios I to the social and political promotion acquired by members of the middle social stratum with his attitude toward the latter's economic activity.

The strict legislation of Andronikos I (r. 1183–1185) regarding shipwreck and salvage protecting cargo and ships cast ashore by storms has recently been labeled exceptional, since the Komnenoi were generally more concerned with the interests of their own family than with the welfare of Byzantine merchants and ship-owners.⁵⁵ In fact, there is no reason to consider these concerns as contradictory. To be sure, the imperial authorities were mainly interested in the levy of taxes, rather than in the conduct of trade. It is simply implausible, though, that they were adverse or even indifferent to trading activities conducted by imperial subjects, a source of imperial revenue they were eager to exploit. This may be illustrated by imperial intervention to protect the interests of Byzantine traders much earlier than the late thirteenth century.

52 Jacoby, "Silk in Western Byzantium," 476–477; Gerolymatou, "L'aristocratie et le commerce," 84–86; George C. Maniatis, "Organization, Market Structure, and Modus Operandi of the Private Silk Industry in Tenth-Century Byzantium," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 53 (1999): 267–271, repr. in George C. Maniatis, *Guilds, Price Formation and Market Structures in Byzantium* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), no. III.

53 Eleutheria Papagianni, "Economic Activity Relative to Social Class," in *EHB*, 2: 1091–1092.

54 Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 147.

55 Laiou, "Exchange and Trade," in *EHB*, 2: 752–753.

In 1192 Pisan and Genoese pirates attacked near Rhodes Venetian ships returning from Egypt, killing the Byzantine merchants and taking hold of the goods on board. Some of these belonged to the Emperor Isaac II Angelos, others to his brother the sebastokrator Alexios, the future Alexios III, to the *mystikos*, a high ranking imperial official whose name is not mentioned, and to merchants, some of whom were the most important merchants of Constantinople. Emperor Isaac II demanded reparations from Pisa and Genoa and seized cash and goods belonging to Genoese and Pisan merchants trading in Constantinople, in response to the pressure exerted by Byzantine merchants.⁵⁶ This was not the first time that an emperor or his wife invested capital in external trade, as noted above. The incident of 1192 reveals that high-ranking members of the Constantinopolitan elite also invested in trade with Egypt. Some of the purchased goods must have been spices, a large portion of which was clearly to be sold in Constantinople. The case implies that the seemingly absence of imperial regard for merchants and trade in the twelfth century may be safely ascribed to the negative attitude of the literary sources and to the paucity of evidence directly illustrating the elite's involvement in trade.

The elite's investments attested in 1192 can have hardly been exceptional. They cast serious doubts upon the assertion that a *new* business group within the social elite of Constantinople emerged only around the mid-fourteenth century. It has been argued that this development was prompted mainly, if not entirely by Byzantine territorial losses in Asia Minor and the Balkans. The loss of their estates and power, so runs the argument, compelled large Byzantine landlords of these regions to find new sources of revenue in trade, shipping and banking in order to uphold their social and economic standing. Nicholas Oikonomides briefly dealt with the group in his study on business people in late Byzantine Constantinople and listed the surnames of elite families increasingly involved in trade and shipping from the mid-fourteenth century onward.⁵⁷ Klaus-Peter Matschke approached the issue in a broader context and in more detail. He pointed to the participation of the elite in Thessalonike

56 Angeliki E. Laiou, "Byzantine Trade with Christians and Muslims and the Crusades," in Laiou and Mottahedeh, *The Crusades*, 157–159, repr. in Angeliki E. Laiou, *Byzantium and the Other: Relations and Exchanges* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2012), no. VIII. Strangely, Laiou has not perceived that the emperor's handling of the incident of 1192 and his response to the merchants of Constantinople contradict her late dating of the 'change' in imperial attitude toward trade.

57 Nicolas Oikonomides, *Hommes d'affaires grecs et latins à Constantinople (XIII^e–XV^e siècles)* (Montreal: Institut d'études médiévales; Paris: Vrin, 1979), 119–123, 126–128; on some members of the elite in trade: Angeliki E. Laiou-Thomadakis, "The Byzantine Economy in the Mediterranean Trade System: Thirteenth-Fifteenth Centuries," *Dumbarton Oaks*

both in trading and shipping, the latter already by the thirteenth century. In addition, he distinguished between members of the elite having connections with Italian businessmen, others gradually losing their landed property and engaging in business enterprises, and those who switched from naval warfare and piracy to maritime trade and transportation. This last group consisted of members of prominent families from Monemvasia, in the southeastern Peloponnese, who in the fourteenth century left their city and settled in Constantinople, headed by the Notaras and members of the leading families in the city, the Eudaimonoioannis, Sophianos and, with some delay, the Mamonas. These expatriates maintained their links with Monemvasia, were instrumental in obtaining enlarged privileges for their city of origin and the immigrants in Constantinople in the reign of John V Palaiologos (r. 1367–1373), yet shifted their business focus toward the Black Sea.

In addition to the influx from the provinces of the empire, Matschke points to Greek commercial and entrepreneurial forces from the islands of Chios and Crete, respectively ruled by Genoa and Venice, who settled in Constantinople and prompted the local Byzantine elite to relinquish its traditional social standards. The members of this elite engaged in business enterprises involving partnership with Latins, leased the collection of Byzantine state taxes, and invested money in Genoese and Venetian state funds. The merchants of the Italian maritime powers, under growing pressure from the Turks, relinquished the subduing of local economic forces in favor of cooperation with Byzantine merchants in the broader Mediterranean economic context. The Byzantines, including members of the elite, became junior partners in that framework and adopted Western business practices. In sum, according to these interpretations, external factors, namely territorial losses and the impact of Latin trade and shipping in the remaining Byzantine space, rather than internal developments within the elite itself generated a re-orientation of the latter's economic activity and changed its social profile and outlook.⁵⁸ On the other hand, Angeliki Laiou considers internal developments as decisive in that respect,

Papers, 34–35 (1980–1981): 199–202, 221–222, repr. in Angeliki E. Laiou, *Gender, Society and Economic Life in Byzantium* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1992), no. VII.

58 Klaus-Peter Matschke – Franz Tinnefeld, *Die Gesellschaft im späten Byzanz. Gruppen, Strukturen und Lebensformen* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2001), 158–220, and on the Turkish conquests, 197–198; Klaus-Peter Matschke, “Commerce. Trade, Markets and Money: Thirteenth-Fifteenth Centuries,” in *EHB*, 2: 803–805; Klaus-Peter Matschke, “Rechtliche und administrative Organisation der Warenversorgung im byzantinischen Raum. Die Strukturen des 13. bis 15. Jahrhunderts,” in Kislinger, Koder, Külzer, *Handels Güter und Verkehrswege*, 209–211.

emphasizing the civil war in the empire that ended in 1354 as the factor depriving many aristocratic families of their estates, while demographic processes and constant wars and invasions had made land unprofitable.⁵⁹

The list of elite families engaging in business ventures compiled by Oikonomides calls for several remarks. It seems to suggest that all these families were involved in trade or shipping in the fourteenth and fifteenth century, whereas the extant Byzantine and Italian documentation illustrates the activity of some families only along that entire period. In fact, most surnames cited appear in a single document, the account book of the Venetian merchant Giacomo Badoer, active in Constantinople from 1436 to 1440.⁶⁰ Two questions regarding these families have not been addressed so far: first, did they indeed own and lose estates in Asia Minor or the Balkans; secondly, if this was the case how, where and when, after being stripped of their landed assets, had they found capital to launch business enterprises. It is anyhow doubtful that a causal link could be established between the territorial losses incurred by aristocratic families and the emergence of a business group within the Byzantine elite of Constantinople around the mid-fourteenth century.

The involvement of elite families from Monemvasia in the Constantinopolitan economy provides an interesting perspective in that respect. It is likely that large landlords in Byzantine Morea promptly responded in the early thirteenth century to growing demand and new export opportunities by promoting the intensification of oil production in their region. They practiced a market-oriented raising of livestock and must have furthered the extension of viticulture and the production of high-grade Monemvasia wine, called 'malvasia' by Westerners, the success and wide diffusion of which began in the early thirteenth century and is well attested by the first half of the fourteenth century.⁶¹ The three *archontes* of Monemvasia representing their city around the mid-thirteenth century were among these large landowners. Their social ascendancy was based on landed estates in Laconia, as evidenced by the agreement they concluded with William II of Villehardouin, prince of Frankish Morea. Their property rights were confirmed by Emperor Michael VIII after the Byzantine recovery of the region in 1262.⁶² Somewhat later the families invested revenue from their estates in maritime trade, shipping, and piracy in

59 Laiou and Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy*, 212.

60 Oikonomides, *Hommes d'affaires*, 121–122.

61 Jacoby, "Rural Exploitation," 253.

62 Ibid., 239. Haris A. Kalligas, *Byzantine Monemvasia. The Sources* (Monemvasia: Akrotheon, 1990), 86–107, argues that Monemvasia's capitulation occurred in 1252 or 1253, rather than in 1248: see *ibid.*, 90–91.

the Aegean. Indeed, after the Byzantine recovery of Monemvasia in 1262 the city became a base from which pirates operated in the eastern Mediterranean.⁶³

It is likely that the members of the three Monemvasiot families who settled in Constantinople invested some revenue from landed estates in the Byzantine Peloponnese in the initial trade ventures they launched in the capital. Their move to Constantinople was not induced by foreign conquest or the loss of estates. Rather, the extension of Venetian economic domination in the western Aegean gradually reduced the profitability of business conducted by the landlords of Byzantine Morea. One aspect of that process was the Venetian protectionist policy and the competing production of wine in Crete, which increasingly affected the export of Monemvasia wine in the course of the fourteenth century.⁶⁴ Monemvasiot expatriates may have furthered the export of Monemvasia wine to Constantinople and the Black Sea. Yet, significantly, their business operations were centered in the capital and directed toward that region, rather than toward their city of origin, as noted earlier.⁶⁵ In short, capital yielded by rural estates in the province was partly shifted toward other areas and other businesses unconnected with these same estates, because these investments offered more lucrative prospects. They included short and medium-range supply of foodstuffs to Constantinople, the farming of state tax collection, and investments in Genoese and Venetian state funds, none of which competed with Italian long-distance trade and shipping.⁶⁶ One may wonder whether the same pattern could explain the origin of the resources and the commercial ventures of the supposedly new business group among the elite of Constantinople. Despite wars and incursions, it is doubtful that land had become unprofitable and capital investments were therefore diverted to other sectors of the economy, as has been claimed. Landed estates clearly remained valuable in the Peloponnese and members of the elite were eager to obtain or enlarge them, although the region suffered from repeated Turkish

63 Matschke – Tinnefeld, *Die Gesellschaft im späten Byzanz*, 172–173; Gareth Morgan, “The Venetian Claims Commission of 1278,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 69 (1976), 425.

64 Jacoby, “Changing Economic Patterns,” 222–224, 227–229; Jacoby, “Rural Exploitation,” 253–254, 256–257.

65 Therefore, there is no justification to consider trade conducted by the expatriates in the Black Sea in conjunction with trade by Monemvasia residents in the Aegean, as done by Laiou and Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy*, 210.

66 Ibid., 211–215; on the farming of state taxes from the eleventh century onward, which reached a peak in the first half of the fifteenth century: see Thierry Ganchou, “Giacomo Badoer et Kyr Théodôros Batatzès, ‘comerchier di pesi’ à Constantinople (flor. 1401–1449),” *Revue des Études Byzantines* 61 (2003): 92–95.

incursions from the second half of the fourteenth century.⁶⁷ It is likely that this was also the case in other Byzantine provinces.

Byzantine sources provide some precisely dated, yet sparse information regarding the Byzantine elite's involvement in business in the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth century.⁶⁸ However, the bulk of evidence is culled from western sources. The Italian documentation bearing on trade and shipping in Byzantium in earlier centuries is far more limited. Not surprisingly, therefore, the information it yields regarding members of the Byzantine elite engaged in business ventures is extremely poor. The evidence regarding the leading families of Monemvasia involved in trade and shipping in the thirteenth century comes almost entirely from western sources, yet there is no similar information for Constantinople. Given the paucity of documentation, one may wonder whether the Constantinopolitan elite refrained from business ventures before the mid-fourteenth century, as generally argued. The trade investments of some individuals positioned at the highest ranks of the elite in 1192, mentioned above, seem to contradict that assumption. The loss of their goods led to diplomatic negotiations between the empire and two western maritime powers. The incident is only known thanks to the chance survival of some documents dealing with it in *western* archives. This recalls the chance survival of evidence regarding Kalomodios, a banker and merchant of lower social rank who had amassed a large fortune, apparently in long-distance trade. His activities are only known from a Byzantine source because his arrest and the confiscation of his property in 1200 created serious turmoil in the capital.⁶⁹ No other Constantinopolitan merchant of his rank and period is known by name.

The arguments I have adduced above strongly support the following reconstruction. Large provincial landowners, merchants and carriers, attentive to social changes and to growing and more diversified demand from the early eleventh century, were the first to respond to market incentives within the empire. The elite sponsored the market-oriented growing and sale of rural produce from its estates before 1204. By extension, some members of the provincial elite engaged as entrepreneurs in the manufacturing of silk textiles, primarily though not exclusively based on raw silk from their own estates, and sold the finished products. Investments in trade and shipping by members of the Constantinopolitan elite, despite their proclaimed social ethos, are documented by the late twelfth century. They must have resumed shortly after

67 Jacoby, "Rural Exploitation," 223, 247, 268–269, 274.

68 See above, 81–82.

69 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. Aloysius L. van Dieten (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae XI/1, Series Berolinensis; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), I, 523–524.

the Byzantine recovery of Constantinople in 1261. In the fourteenth century expatriate members of the elite from Monemvasia initially financed their business ventures in Constantinople with revenue from rural exploitation. This may have also been the pattern contributing to the growing participation of Constantinople's elite in trade and shipping, in connection with the increasing role of the city in transit trade.⁷⁰ It would seem, therefore, that there was no emergence of a new business group among the Constantinopolitan elite in the mid-fourteenth century. Rather, the business involvement of members of the Byzantine élite from that period onward simply appears to be better documented, both by western sources and by Byzantine authors, who had willfully overlooked it until then.

The more abundant documentation of western origin or preserved in the West not only projects a skewed perspective of the Byzantine elite's involvement in the market economy from the eleventh century onward. The chance survival of a few western notary charters recording transactions in Byzantine rural produce and the absence of corresponding Byzantine documentation has resulted in an overrating of the Italians' role in the empire's trade and, more generally, of their impact on the empire's economy in the late eleventh and twelfth century. This view has still been upheld in a recent study describing the Italians as the initiators of large-scale exports of oil from the Peloponnese in the twelfth century, Byzantine merchants adopting their practices.⁷¹ On the whole, though, the impact of the Italians upon the Byzantine economy has been gradually downgraded over the last forty years or so. Nevertheless some still consider that they spearheaded the quickening of trade in the empire,⁷² yet this development was already underway when they were granted commercial privileges from the late eleventh century onward. The sources examined above suggest that the Italians integrated within the Byzantine economy at the juncture of the market-oriented exploitation of rural resources and an already dynamic supply system feeding the empire's urban markets.⁷³

70 David Jacoby, "The Economy of Byzantine Constantinople, ca. 850–1453," in *From Byzantium to Istanbul. 8000 Years of a Capital*, Exhibition catalogue, Sabanci University, Sakip Sabanci Museum (Istanbul: Sakip Sabanci Museum, 2010), 99–101, 248–249 (endnotes).

71 Pamela Armstrong, "Merchants of Venice at Sparta in the 12th century," in William G. Cavanagh, Chrysanthi Gallou, Mercourios Georgiadis, eds., *Sparta and Laconia: From Prehistory to Pre-Modern* (London: British School at Athens, 2009), 319–320.

72 Laiou and Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy*, 145–146.

73 Jacoby, "Venetian Commercial Expansion," 376–380; David Jacoby, "Amalfitani in Bisanzio, nel Levante e in Egitto (secc. X–XIII)," in Bruno Figliuolo e Pinuccia Simbula,

The paucity of data regarding the contribution of Byzantine merchants and ships to the empire's maritime trade in the late eleventh and twelfth century prevents any reliable assessment of the Italian contribution in that framework. In terms of available resources and shipping tonnage none of the Italian maritime powers could have competed with the empire's traders and maritime carriers at that stage.⁷⁴ It is undeniable, though, that the Italians' share in the empire's internal and external trade and shipping increased substantially in the twelfth century,⁷⁵ and that their activity stimulated rural production and trade in rural produce in various regions of the empire.⁷⁶ The pace of that growth accelerated after 1261. The larger and more dynamic demand clearly induced growing numbers of the Byzantine elite to invest in trade and shipping.

Finally, we have to address the contention that Turkish pressure strengthened cooperation between Italian and Byzantine merchants and that the Italians willingly ceded a share of their business to Byzantine subjects in that connection. It is obvious that cooperation between large Byzantine landlords and Italian merchants buying their produce began well before the mid-fourteenth century, as noted earlier. In addition, Byzantine merchants and ship operators supplied a large portion of the local infrastructure and logistics of short and medium-range trade and shipping, without which the operation of long-distance trans-Mediterranean commerce would have been impossible. There is no reason to assume, therefore, that there was any Turkish impact in that respect.

The Byzantine elite's approach to the market economy and its involvement in the latter's operation is poorly documented over a long period. Only particular circumstances account for the survival of some important evidence from the eleventh and twelfth centuries in that respect. The relationship of the Byzantine elite to the market economy becomes more visible from the mid-fourteenth century onward, because the sources are more abundant. However, since these are mostly western, they fail to reflect accurately the elite's attitudes and activities. The recourse to circumstantial evidence is therefore indispensable. It allows for a more balanced assessment of these issues and provides some new insights into their evolution.

eds., *Interscambi socio-culturali ed economici fra le città marinare d'Italia e l'Occidente dagli osservatori mediterranei* (in press).

74 See above, n. 36.

75 David Jacoby, "Byzantine Trade with Egypt from the Mid-Tenth Century to the Fourth Crusade," *Thesaurismata* 30 (2000): 47–74, repr. in Jacoby, *Commercial Exchange*, no. 1.

76 Jacoby, "Rural Exploitation," 224, 249, 254, 270, 272–273.

George of Trebizond, Renaissance Libertarian?

James Hankins

It is not easy to find a place for George of Trebizond in the history of Western political thought. The narratives constructed by modern authorities on the Renaissance period emphasize themes like the revival of ancient political thought, civic humanism, republican liberty, Machiavellian political realism, the rise of the state and the idea of sovereignty, the emergence of utopianism, the Reformation's attack on the ecclesiastical polity, Erastianism and the development of resistance theory, the struggle between constitutionalism and absolutism.¹ The most interesting political ideas in George's writings do not check any of those boxes. He sometimes earns a footnote for his claim that the Venetian mixed constitution had its source in Plato's *Laws*, a text he was the first to translate into Latin.² But for the most part his political thought has been completely neglected.³ In part this may be because his most striking positions are hidden in a few chapters of his extended, three-book rant against Plato and the latter's malign influence on Christian civilization, the *Comparatio philosophorum Aristotelis et Platonis* (1457/58), available today only in a few manuscripts and in a single, corrupt edition of 1523.⁴ But mostly, I believe, he

-
- 1 The most influential Anglo-American surveys are Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978); James H. Burns, ed., *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought, c. 350–1450* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Antony Black, *Political Thought in Europe, 1250–1450* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992); James H. Burns with Mark Goldie, eds., *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
 - 2 See John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of his Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 102–3; John Monfasani, ed., *Collectanea Trapezuntiana: Texts, Documents and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond* (Binghamton NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1984), 744–47; James Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 1: 181–4.
 - 3 Hankins, *Plato*, 1: 174–80, sketches some of the themes discussed in more detail and from a different perspective in the present contribution.
 - 4 For the manuscripts and the 1523 edition, see Monfasani, *Trapezuntiana*, 600–2, and John Monfasani, “A Tale of Two Books: Bessarion's *In Calumniatorem Platonis* and George of Trebizond's *Comparatio Philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis*,” *Renaissance Studies* 22, 1

has been neglected because his ideas about liberty and cosmopolitanism are too far out of the mainstream of Renaissance political thought, or what is perceived as the mainstream. Recent studies of liberty in the Renaissance emphasize the role of the 'non-domination' model of liberty in Renaissance republics: liberty as equalization of political power among citizens.⁵ Recent studies of empire in the Renaissance focus on the dynamics of imperial expansion, the elaboration of imperial ideologies and the justification of empire.⁶ George's model of personal liberty bears a closer resemblance to that of classical liberalism or even libertarianism than it does to the 'non-domination' model. And his advocacy of cosmopolitan empire is founded on arguments quite different from those of either ancient or modern theorists of universal government.⁷ Moreover, no one could call mainstream the actual empire George envisaged, which involved a future, providentially destined alliance between an Ottoman universal monarchy and the Roman Catholic Church. Perhaps all this does, in fact, make George sound marginal. My argument here, however, is not that he was typical, but that he was prophetic.

• • •

(2007): 1–15. The 1523 edition is accessible online via the Hathi Trust Digital Library (original from the Universidad Complutense de Madrid).

- 5 See Philip Pettit, *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), and Quentin Skinner, "The Republican Ideal of Political Liberty," in *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, eds. Gisela Bock, Quentin Skinner and Maurizio Viroli (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 293–309; Quentin Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- 6 Recent studies of Renaissance political thought regarding empires include Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c. 1500–c.1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995); David Lupher, *Romans in a New World: Classical Models in Sixteenth-Century Spanish America* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003); Mikael Hornqvist, *Machiavelli and Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Margaret Meserve, *Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2008); Monique O'Connell, *Men of Empire: Power and Negotiation in Venice's Maritime State* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009); Benedict Kingsbury, ed., *The Roman Foundations of the Law of Nations: Alberico Gentili and the Justice of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Peter Stacey, *Roman Monarchy and the Renaissance Prince* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- 7 The Renaissance period has not attracted much interest from historians of cosmopolitanism. There are a few remarks in Derek Heater, *World Citizenship and Government: Cosmopolitan Ideas in the History of Western Political Thought* (New York: St. Martins, 1996), 48–52 (chiefly on Erasmus and Lipsius).

Let's begin with George's cosmopolitanism. The longest discussion of this subject occurs in Chapter 11 of Book III of the *Comparatio*.⁸ There George is elaborating his obsessive theme that Plato in his life and thought always favored what was *contra naturam* and therefore morally wrong, destructive or impossible. In Book III George provides an extended refutation of Plato's *Laws*. Plato claims (according to George) that his ideal city, Magnesia, will be happy and eternal. George argues that it will in fact be miserable and short-lived if it follows Plato's prescriptions for a closed, authoritarian, hierarchical, static, inward-looking, and deeply conservative society. George prefers societies that are the opposite: open, meritocratic, dynamic, militant, cosmopolitan, and wealth-producing.

What seems to have set George off in particular was a passage at the end of Book VIII of the *Laws* (850b–c) where Plato declares that resident aliens may come to Magnesia and engage in trade, but they can't stay longer than twenty years. Children of resident aliens can only be craftsmen and also are limited to twenty years' residence after reaching their fifteenth year. In other passages Plato prohibits them from engaging in politics, teaching, or intermarrying with the local population. Plato's legislation is meant presumably to prevent the citizen body from being infected with foreign ideas and to prevent foreigners from ever constituting a faction within the city.⁹

George's praise of cosmopolitanism begins with an impassioned attack on these laws, an attack whose fervor surely springs from George's own experience as an alien in foreign cities. Indeed he was doubly an alien, since his family had immigrated to Venetian Crete from Trebizond, and he later immigrated as a young man to Italy from Crete, where he had considerable difficulty overcoming prejudice against his foreign origins, even within the mainland Venetian empire.¹⁰ George's attack on Plato's immigration laws took the line that they were simply impractical. No immigrants would go to Magnesia as a resident aliens if they were going to be prohibited from participating in politics, military and cultural life, no matter how long they lived there, and if they would not be allowed to put down roots, become citizens, and better themselves and the lives of their children. Furthermore, since native citizens of Magnesia will be prohibited from taking part in crafts and trade, all such business will be

8 *Comparatio* 1523, sign. Q8v–R4v.

9 For an overview of Plato's late political theory see George Klosko, *The Development of Plato's Political Theory* (London: Methuen, 1986); for more recent perspectives see Christopher Bobonich, *Plato's Laws: A Critical Guide* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

10 Monfasani, *George of Trebizond*, *passim*.

missing from the city. Who will do these jobs if there are no resident aliens to do them, especially as they have been branded by Plato as low-status jobs? How can a city survive without crafts, how can it prosper without foreign trade? Furthermore, Plato placed all agricultural labor on the backs of slaves; citizens were to engage in farming only in supervisory roles. This means that Magnesian citizen-soldiers will not acquire the toughness and endurance that makes the best soldiers; their military training won't amount to more than play, field exercises. They won't be able to survive the rigors of real campaigning. There won't be a Magnesian Regulus to leave his plow and fight in the legions; there will be no rugged farmer-soldiers like the Athenian hoplites in its phalanx. Magnesia will be impoverished, rustic and unable to defend itself against rich and powerful predators.

George adds an interesting bioclimatological argument, derived ultimately from Hippocrates,¹¹ that it is environment, not genetics, that makes one truly belong to a particular place. "Everyone is by nature a citizen of the city where he was born." Those who are born and live for long periods in a country acquire corporeal complexions and a character from that country's physical situation and climate; their piety and their souls will have been shaped by the local religion. A resident alien born and bred in Magnesia will be as much a Magnesian as a child of citizen parents. This idea of natural citizenship, which George admits is contrary to the nativist prejudices of classical Greece – not just to Plato's *Laws* – is the basis of his argument for a kind of cosmopolitanism. Nativism – restricting citizen rights to the children of citizen parents – is unjust because it treats natural citizens as aliens, even those who have much to contribute to the commonwealth. George uses his own experience as an example. Despite the fact that his great-grandfather had emigrated to Crete from Trebizond, a successor state of the Byzantine empire in the Black Sea, he, George, never seemed to see that city in his dreams or 'any Cappadocian monster' (Typhoeus?), but often dreamed, sleeping and awake, of the city of Crete where he was born (probably Candia), its walls, gates, forum, temples, port, and buildings.

Wouldn't he therefore be highly unjust if someone used his laws to push me out [of Candia] as a Pontine and barbarous man, or as a Scythian or Thracian, an alien to all virtue, as the proverb says?¹²

11 See especially his treatise *On Airs, Waters and Places* for many observations about the effects of climate on a person's complexional nature and character.

12 *Comparatio* 1523, sign. R1r-v: "Non igitur iniquissimus esset, si quis me inde quasi Ponticum atque barbarum hominem aut Scytam aut Tracem a virtute penitus, ut pro-

Whatever his family's remote origins, he was obviously now a man of high culture; he shouldn't be classed with rude barbarians from the Black Sea; he should be accepted anywhere because of his merits.

Here George gestures towards a justice argument for cosmopolitanism, applying to a different context the standard humanist argument in favor of meritocracy and against hereditary right.¹³ Virtue should be rewarded, whatever its origins. But the real focus of his argument for open societies and the free movement of talented individuals is a politically realist one. Cosmopolitanism is good because it makes states powerful. The great example from antiquity is Rome. George praises the Romans for including ever-widening populations of foreigners within the ranks of its citizens. The practice went back to Romulus, whom George compares favorably to Plato for his inclusiveness. While Plato keeps foreigners at arm's length, Romulus was much wiser than *doctus Plato*, and much more successful:

Witness the city of Rome and the Roman People itself, whose wealth equaled the wealth of the whole world, above all because they willingly gave foreigners citizenship. For Romulus, its founder, having laid its foundations, immediately opened it up as an asylum in imitation of the archaic Greeks, and summoned not only the innocent but the guilty. Then he did not abuse as slaves his neighbors that he had defeated in war, but destroyed their towns and compelled them to immigrate to Rome, where he offered them exactly the same rights as his own citizens. . . . [Romulus] not only had the humanity to grant liberty to defeated enemies, whom by the law of nations he might have reduced to slavery, but even with the utmost goodwill gave them citizenship.¹⁴

verbio dicitur, alienum, legibus suis extruderet?" Pontines are peoples from the Black Sea, part of the region northeast of classical Greece which the Greeks imagined to be populated by barbarous peoples such as the Scythians and Thracians. George perhaps thought his dream probative because of the ancient medical doctrine that a 'synkrimatic' dream revealed one's true nature. So the dream shows that George is really a Cretan, not a Pontine; the detail that George had not seen a 'Cappadocian monster' indicates that his dream was healthy, not diseased. See Steven M. Oberhelman, "The Diagnostic Dream in Ancient Medical Theory and Practice," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 61, 1 (Spring 1987): 47–60.

13 For a useful anthology of texts, see Albert Rabil, Jr., *Knowledge, Goodness and Power: The Debate over Nobility among Quattrocento Italian Humanists* (Binghamton NY: MRTS, 1991). Andrea Robiglio is currently finishing a monograph on this tradition of thought.

14 *Comparatio* 1523, sign. R1v–R2r: "Testis est urbs Roma ipseque populus Romanus, cuius opes non alia re magis orbis terrarum opibus exequatae sunt quam quod peregrinos ultro

Hence it was that Romulus' laws subjected all the world to Rome, while Plato's had never held sway over even the smallest clod of earth (*ne glebula quidem*). Romulus' laws "made all of Italy into one city." This inclusive attitude to citizenship in the end made Rome wealthy and enduring. Indeed, by Augustus' time the Romans had

made all the world one city – and why? So that its wealth and resources might grow and so that its empire might last the longer, since everyone was well-disposed to the Roman Empire as though it were their own.¹⁵

Because "no man felt himself to be a foreigner" in Rome, Rome attracted the loyalty necessary to maintain a great empire. Men found advancement in the Roman Empire based on their good fortune (*felicitas*) and their virtue (*virtus*); even men from far-off Spain could become emperors if they were worthy. Rome remained a great empire so long as virtue was rewarded without discrimination (*communitur*). Cosmopolitanism made the Romans great; but it was their tendency to nativism, their habit of closing the polis to foreign talent, that brought an end to the free city-states of Greece at the end of the classical era.¹⁶ *A fortiori* Plato's strict nativist criteria for citizen rights would doom Magnesia to failure.

Even more striking is George's praise of the Ottoman Turks – Christian Europe's great geopolitical rival – for the cosmopolitan empire they had founded. The reason why the power of the Turks had grown so great so quickly, says George, is that they did not distinguish between Italians and Greeks and Scythians, or even between Thessalians and Epirotes or Thracians. In other words, they included even barbarians in their empire; they did not make

ciuitatem donabant. Romulus enim conditor statim fundamentis iactis, veteres imitatus graecos, asylum aperuit, nec innocentes solum, verum etiam noxios convocabat. Deinde bello victis finitimis, non quasi servis abusus est, sed Romam migrare coactis, oppidis eorum dirutis, idem omnino ius praestitit quod et civibus suis. . . . Hic [Romulus] superatos etiam hostes et iure gentium in seruitutem redactos, non libertatem solum humaniter, sed ciuitatem quoque summa ex benignitate donabat."

- 15 *Comparatio* 1523, sign. R2v: "Totum orbem unam ciuitatem fecerunt, cur? Ut et opes crescerent, et diutius imperium perduraret, cum omnes romano imperio tamquam suo afficerentur." Compare Aelius Aristides, *Encomium Romae*, in Charles A. Behr, trans., *P. Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1981–86), 80: "You Romans govern throughout the whole inhabited world as if in a single city." For Trebizond's debt here to Aelius Aristides, see below.
- 16 The comparison between Rome's mastery of the art of empire and the Greeks' failure is again based on Aristides' *Encomium Romae*, in *The Complete Works*, trans. Behr, 81–85.

distinctions of status between barbarians and those who claimed to be civilized. We Europeans (says George) talk about this one being born free, that one a slave; we say this one is of noble birth, that one of unknown origin; this one of citizen birth, that one of foreign origin.

Not so with the Turks: they say that all alike are human beings (*homines*), and make no difference between man and man, except differences of virtue.¹⁷

It's true they persecute Christians, but that is only because they consider the practice of their impious religion as a mark of virtue; that is why they persecute us Christians, for the vice of impiety, and this constitutes the only just reason for us to hate them. Thus the only limit on cosmopolitanism George recognizes is religious: the only persons rightly excluded from full participation in the state are those who participate in an impious cult. The Ottomans were mistaken in believing Islam the true religion, but correct to regard the practice of a false cult *in se* as vicious and therefore a grounds for exclusion from citizen rights.

This created a dilemma. George professed to admire the cosmopolitan Ottoman Empire more than any contemporary Western state. But of course the Ottomans were Muslims, followers of what George, like other late medieval Christians, regarded as a heretical sect of Christianity. The only solution would be for them to convert to true, Roman Christianity, and this is precisely what George set about to accomplish. He had himself appointed a missionary to the Ottoman court and set out for Constantinople in 1466, hoping to convert the Sultan, Mehmed II, to Roman Christianity.¹⁸ His apologetic tool would be Aristotelianism, the divinely-inspired philosophy that had kept Roman Christianity from theological corruption and, as Thomas Aquinas had argued, was ideally suited to convert infidels to the truth. His task would be all the easier as Mehmed was already an Aristotelian philosopher-king. Once the great Turk was a Catholic too, God would see to it that he would achieve world dominion and become the Autocrat of all nations. The best of all human governments would then come at last, with the true religion, Roman Christianity, embraced by a just, cosmopolitan ruler steeped in the true philosophy of Aristotle.¹⁹

17 *Comparatio* 1523, sign. R3r: "Turci non sic, sed omnes ita dicunt homines esse, ut nullam differentiam inter hominem et hominem faciant, nisi uirtutis."

18 See Monfasani, *George of Trebizond*, 131–32, 184–94.

19 On George's mission see Texts CXLIII–V in Monfasani, ed., *Trapezuntiana*, 491–574.

George's mission to the Turks will inevitably seem a lunatic project to us moderns, and it must have also aroused scorn or amusement in the court of the sultan. But although it is unlikely that George ever obtained the interview he sought with the Great Turk, the plan would not have seemed so impractical to contemporary Christians as it does to us. The idea of converting a nation to Roman Christianity by converting its rulers had plenty of precedents in Christian history, beginning with Constantine the Great, the founder of the Christian empire, and continuing through Clovis the Frank, St. Stephen of Hungary, Recared the Visigoth and others.²⁰ St. Francis of Assisi himself had been the model for attempts to convert Islamic rulers to Christianity. And only a few years before Pope Pius II had famously written his *Letter to Mahomet* in which he too tried to argue the sultan out of his Muslim beliefs.²¹

It is clear that George's cosmopolitanism is a different animal from what moderns think of as cosmopolitanism. In fact it doesn't fit neatly into either ancient philosophical or modern political taxonomies of cosmopolitanism.²² It does resemble superficially certain anti-establishment attitudes of the founder of Cynicism, Diogenes of Sinope,²³ who according to Diogenes Laertius used to "mock good birth and reputation and all such distinctions, calling them the cosmetics (*prokosmemata*) of vice. The only right polity was that bounded by the cosmos" (*Lives of the Philosophers*, 6.72, my trans.). "When asked what polis he came from, Diogenes answered that he was a citizen of the

20 George himself, addressing Mehmed II in *On the Eternal Glory of the Autocrat*, (*Trapezuntiana*, 495), discussed how the Goths had converted to Christianity (in its heretical Arian form) and were rewarded by Providence with the conquest of Rome. But, warned George, when they failed to convert to Roman Catholicism they were quickly wiped out.

21 See James Hankins, "Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II," in id., *Humanism and Platonism in the Italian Renaissance*, 2 vols. (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2003–2004), I: 293–424 at 319–320.

22 For ancient cosmopolitanism in general see Anthony A. Long, "The Concept of the Cosmopolitan in Greek and Roman Thought," *Daedalus* 137, 3 (Summer 2008): 50–58; for a detailed account of Cynic cosmopolitanism see John Moles, "The Cynics," in *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*, eds. Christopher Rowe and Malcolm Schofield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 419–34; for typologies of modern ideological cosmopolitanism, see Pauline Kleingeld and Eric Brown, "Cosmopolitanism," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), forthcoming URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/cosmopolitanism/>>.

23 Sinope, interestingly, is a port city on the Black Sea, only about 500 km west of Trebizond, and like Trebizond a place where Greeks mingled with 'barbarian' peoples; Diogenes too lived as a resident alien in more civilized cities such as Athens and Corinth.

cosmos" (*kosmopolites*; *ibid.*, 6.63). Diogenes emphasized that men were equal by nature (*physis*) and that status distinctions were purely a matter of *nomos*, artificial customs and laws. George's attempts to destabilize nativist prejudice and assert the claims of virtue, natural citizenship and common humanity look a bit like Cynic positions, but George certainly did not share the Cynics, aggressive primitivism, contempt for law and culture, and hostility to participation in politics and the economy.

Nor does George's position appear to owe much to the cosmopolitanism of the Stoics. George does not appeal to moral universalism, natural law, cosmic citizenship, the transcendence of civic and ethnic boundaries by philosophic wisdom, or any of the usual Stoic arguments for cosmopolitanism. It is highly probable, to be sure, that George had encountered the famous cosmopolitan dictum, that the cosmos is a single city to which all gods and men belonged, in the pages of some Stoic writer or other.²⁴ But the more likely source for the cosmopolitan sentiments he expressed (as quoted above) is one that is named explicitly in the *Comparatio* itself, namely a speech of Aelius Aristides, the second-century AD sophist, known as the *Encomium Romae*.²⁵

In this speech, indeed, we find, worked out in much greater detail than in George's *Comparatio*, a theory of cosmopolitan empire that must have been the inspiration for George's. Aristides praises the Roman empire for "govern[ing] throughout the whole inhabited world as if in a single city" (80). Rome manifests "a great and fair equality between the weak and powerful, obscure and famous, poor and rich and noble." The Romans had mastered the art of empire in ways the Greeks of the classical period had never managed to do. The latter had failed because they didn't know how to include their subject cities in the benefits of empire; instead they exploited and tyrannized them.

Although their possessions were minute, for example border lands and allotments, they could not even preserve these through their inexperience and inability in government, since they neither led their cities with

24 Possible sources for the dictum are Cicero's *Laws* 1.7.23, and *De finibus* 3.62 (Cicero is speaking as a Stoic in both passages); less plausibly Philo, *On the Creation of the Universe* 3 or Plutarch, *On the Fortune of Alexander* (*Moralia* 329a–b).

25 See nn. 15 and 16 above. The translations below are Behr's; the citations are to the pages of his translation, cited in n. 15. For a Greek text and commentary see Francesca Fontanella, ed., *Elio Aristide: A Roma* (Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2007). On Aristides's *Encomium Romae*, see Laurent Pernot, "Aelius Aristides and Rome," in *Aelius Aristides between Greece, Rome and the Gods*, ed. William V. Harris and Brooke Holmes (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 175–201.

generosity nor were able to hold them firmly, being at the same time oppressive and weak (85).

But the Romans had acquired vast experience of rule because of the enormous size of their empire, and they understood that the way to preserve it was through equal justice for all and by giving Roman citizenship to the best element in each city:

Everywhere you have made citizens all those who are the more accomplished, noble and powerful people, even if they retain their native affinities, while the remainder you have made subjects and governed (85).

You Romans knew that your empire would be the greater if you made the virtuous partners in government, “giving freedom and self-rule to the best of them” (94). “You classify no one as a foreigner in respect of any service which he is capable of performing and which needs to be done” (89).

And in your pride you have not made [Rome] admired by giving no one else a share of it, but you have sought a citizen body worthy of it, and you have caused the word “Roman” to belong not to a city, but to be the name of a sort of common race, and this not one out of all the races, but a balance to all the remaining ones. . . . Your governance is universal and like that of a single city. . . . and [thus] there has arisen a single harmonious government which has embraced all men (86–87).

George clearly derives from Aristides the concept of universal empire run by a transnational elite of virtue. Yet George does contribute a couple elements of his own to the picture. One is to connect the growing wealth of Rome with the removal of trade barriers between cities; Aristides had attributed the universal splendor of the empire’s cities to the generous distribution of Rome’s wealth by the emperor. Another was the power-oriented, almost Machiavellian character of George’s argument – that openness to merit whatever its source makes a country stronger and better able to compete among rival states than artificial social hierarchies or nativist prejudice. This instrumentalist style of argumentation is missing in Aristides.

George’s argument from political realism is indeed one that would fit awkwardly in the toolkit either of the ancient Stoics or of Aristides. His ideal of a cosmopolitan empire also fails to fit neatly in the taxonomy of modern cosmopolitanisms. Modern theorists who advocate one-world government generally reject imperialism (at least in name), favoring consensual and democratic world institutions. Modern ‘moral’ cosmopolitans focus on subjects like

universal human rights and justice, the need for cooperation to prevent environmental disasters, or the nature and degree of one's duty to aid foreigners who are suffering.²⁶ Even so, George shares enough common ground with modern cosmopolitans, especially in his emphasis on inclusiveness, universal human nature, and equal treatment for persons of foreign origins, to identify him as their forerunner. Direct influence of George on later cosmopolitans is of course improbable. But George's arguments and illustrations disclose the nature of the audience he appeals to: educated members of mercantile oligarchies, itinerant intellectuals, and international clerical elites. The discovery of a receptive audience in the commercialized world of the Renaissance for a vision of a less parochial international order, as well as his vivid demonstration of the incompatibility between Plato's illiberal politics and the dynamism of contemporary Italian city states, surely qualifies George as some sort of prophet of cosmopolitanism.

• • •

Nevertheless, it risks anachronism to apply the label of classical liberal or libertarian to George's brand of cosmopolitanism. This is not to say that there are no analogies with modern libertarian positions. Most contemporary libertarians advocate open borders and a free international labor market, prefer meritocracy to closed elites, and criticize governments that reserve economic privileges for favored groups or individuals. Modern libertarians would surely be sympathetic to George's view that the removal of political barriers to the economic activity of individuals and states leads to prosperity. One may be permitted to doubt, however, whether George's grand solution to the problems of nativism, economic particularism and closed elites – an Ottoman empire imposing Roman Catholic orthodoxy – would have been warmly embraced by a Friedrich Hayek or a Robert Nozick. In fact, as is well known, the rise of classical liberalism at the end of the seventeenth century was motivated in part by an increasingly urgent need to separate religious and political authority.²⁷ Such attitudes lay beyond George's horizon.

The case is much stronger for placing George's arguments for personal liberty under the rubric of classical liberal and libertarian positions. The key

26 For an overview of issues and concerns in modern cosmopolitanism (a huge academic industry), see Garrett Wallace Brown and David Held, eds., *The Cosmopolitan Reader* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010).

27 Especially insightful is John Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture: Religious Intolerance and Arguments for Religious Tolerance in Early Modern and 'Early Enlightenment' Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

passage where George lays out his views on the subject is found in Chapter 12 of Book III of the *Comparatio*.²⁸ Here too he is criticizing the *Laws* for its hostility to social mobility and its prejudice against growth. Plato's Magnesia is designed to lock people and their descendants permanently into fixed economic classes, without the possibility of ever rising or falling from one's status. His polity is meant to be sustainable, in one sense of that word: its population is fixed at 5040 hearths; it is not allowed to become larger or wealthier. If growth begins to occur, steps are taken to control the population (a one-child policy?), or colonies are sent out so as to dispose of the excess citizenry. Plato thinks such measures will keep the city stable and happy. George disagrees. In his view, the larger, wealthier, and more powerful a city is, the better chance it has of surviving and flourishing, just as bodies survive the longest that try to achieve their maximum size. Plato's view that bigger cities have more civil unrest is historically uninformed, says George. And if money is the sinews of the state, where, Plato (George asks), is that money going to come from, since you've forbidden your citizens to engage in commerce (*mercatura*)? It's commercial activity that generates private wealth and therefore public revenue (*vectigalia*). You won't be able to hire foreign soldiers (and we remember that George is writing in the great age of the *condottieri*) and your own soldiers will be too soft to fight, since they won't be allowed to go far from the city on campaigns and their training will be confined to gymnasia.

In fact, says George, establishing permanent economic classes based on possession of fixed allotments of landed property, thus forbidding social mobility, will not make Plato's polity stable; it will have the opposite effect. It will lead to sedition and hostility among classes. Relationships of mutual help – the cement of social relations – and an ethic of public service cannot form unless there is some possibility of improving one's status.

When you [Plato] create great inequalities between income groups and make that inequality permanent and unchanging, you take away all good will both between the classes and towards the commonwealth. How could the lower class *possibly* embrace the higher in love, especially when it is quite certain that it cannot legally enrich itself by its labor and ascend to a higher class? How will an order which is rich in perpetuity non contemn and despise an order which is always poor, and always will be poor? And what man will serve the commonwealth when he knows he is prevented by law from rising to a higher station even if he is a man

28 *Comparatio* 1523, sign. R4v–R8r.

of great ability, even if he willingly undergoes perils, toils and vigils and other difficult tasks [for the state]?²⁹

This passage exposes the underlying reason why, in George's view, Plato's legislation is bound to fail. Men have a natural disposition to social mobility. They will always try to improve their position in a polity, either by their wits (*ingenium*) or by rendering splendid services to the state. Plato's solution to this natural desire for recognition is to hand out public honors to the best citizens. But this, says George, just shows Plato's ignorance of what real human nature is like. Plato says that the desire for wealth is foolish; the wise desire honor. George replies that the desire for wealth is simply human. Honors without emoluments are empty. Ambitious people want more than medals and magistracies. They want a real rise in status, "but you, [Plato], allow no silver, no gold, no fine clothes or other precious things to be held by private persons."³⁰ Public honors are all very well, but men seek security along with honor and they seek to secure the future of their families too. Men are not worker bees, answering blindly the orders of superiors. They are fully rational, which means they think and plan for the future and for that of their families. They understand that wealth and status are a way to secure the future.

Men are driven by a kind of appetite to produce [*or procure*] wealth both for themselves and their children, and since man is an animal composed of body and soul, legislators will value bodily welfare too, if they are wise. Thus at nature's command the soul grows in newborn children and is made capable of handling affairs more effectively. But if we are not allowed to look after ourselves and our relations, if our labor brings us no private benefit, the soul is cast down and made effeminate, and ultimately is reduced to a mere counterfeit of its nature. This appetite must not therefore be pulled out by the roots. It is not right nor possible to strip souls of considerations of private utility; nor is it in the least profitable.

29 Ibid., R6r: "Nam cum permagnam inequalitatem censuum facias, eamque immobilem ac perpetuam statuas, omnem beniulentiā ordinum et inter se et ad rem publicam tollis. Qui enim poterit fieri ut inferior in censu ordo superiorem amore complectatur, praesertim cum certior sit non posse legibus ditior laboribus suis fieri, ac ad maiorem censum conscendere, aut quomodo ditior in perpetuum ordo eum qui est semperque futurus pauper sit non contemnat atque aspernetur? Rem publicam uero quis colet cuius legibus nec si ingenio pollet, nec si libentius pericula suscipiat, labores subeat, vigilias ceteraque ardua perpetiatur, ad maiora euasurum se sciat?"

30 Ibid.: "... tu nihil argenti, nihil auri, nihil vestium aliarumque praeciosissimarum rerum haberi privatim permittis."

You [Plato] demand the impossible, and even if it were possible, it would not be expedient. These things must be tempered by reason, not entirely prohibited.³¹

The idea that human beings have a natural and legitimate desire to rise in wealth and status is an astonishing claim in a civilization that revered lordship, believed social hierarchies to be natural and regarded with suspicion and contempt anyone who tried to “rise above his station.” This was true even in Renaissance Italy, of all Western societies the one the most open to rising talent and the most egalitarian in its mores. George’s defense of the pursuit of personal wealth is to my knowledge the most radical of any humanist of the Renaissance; it goes well beyond the ‘civic humanist’ defense of wealth as an aid to civic virtue and military strength. It would seem to be prophetic of new spirit of free enterprise that Max Weber thought was rooted in Protestantism, but which Hans Baron, already in the 1920s, rightly traced to ‘the spirit of the Quattrocento’ and Italian humanism.³²

No wonder George hated Plato’s political thought, the polar opposite of all that is liberal. George had the insight to realize that Plato’s politics was anchored in his psychology, which also needed to be exposed as false. In the passage just quoted George alludes to what is one of his recurrent criticism of Plato: that Plato’s psychology understands human beings as souls dwelling in bodies, bodies that are mere vehicles, distinct from a man’s real self. Thus he tends to treat human nature as potentially angelic and to dismiss the legitimate needs of the body. George’s own preferred authority, Aristotle, had a sounder view of human nature as an indivisible complex of soul and body, as

31 Ibid., R6v: “Appetitu quodam concitantur homines, Plato, ut quam maximas possint opes et sibi et liberis suis parent. Nam cum homo animal sit ex animo atque corpore compositum, corpori etiam commoda sua legum latores tribuerint, nisi desipiant. Itaque natura duce natis liberis crescit animus et multo maior ad rem gerendam efficitur. Quod si nec nobis nec nostris providere licebit, si labor noster priuatim quoque non conferat, deicitur animus atque effeminatur, et tandem in fucorum naturam redigitur. Non ergo hic appetitus euellendus radicitus est. Nec enim potest nec deglabrandus animus a priuatae utilitatis cogitationibus; nec enim quicquam proficies. Impossibilia iuberet; nec, si possibilia essent, conducibilia etiam essent. Temperanda igitur ratione ista sunt, non omnino prohibenda hominibus.”

32 Hans Baron, *In Search of Florentine Civic Humanism: Essays on the Transition from Medieval to Modern Thought*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), especially essays 7–9 in volume 1. See also Mark Jurdjevic, “Virtue, Commerce, and the Enduring Florentine Republican Moment: Reintegrating Italy into the Atlantic Republican Debate,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 62, 4 (2001): 721–43.

a substance where the soul is the first actuality or form of the body, separable from it in thought but not *in re*, at least in this life. Hence Aristotle's political philosophy was more sensible than Plato's in that it took account of bodily as well as psychic needs in defining happiness.³³

Seeking wealth is therefore not something below human nature; in fact it is intrinsic to it. Just as man is a political animal, just as he is a material substance, just as he has a natural desire to know, so also he is a *hoping* creature, a creature that thinks about and works to better his condition, in this life and the next.

For just as the brute animals live in the present by their imagination [*phantasia*], so man is sustained in life by hope of future things. And this is proper to him. It would be harder for you to make a man invisible or unpolitical or incapable of learning than it would be to take hope entirely from him: for whichever of these you take away, you necessarily take away from him what it is to be human.³⁴

Hope makes man seek wealth, and hence is natural and praiseworthy. But of course, like all other human desires, the desire to acquire wealth can become disordered; it needs therefore to be moderated by reason and confined within the limits of what is honorable. Hence the legislator needs to establish a legal framework within which the individual can exercise his right to free economic activity, but this framework should be careful not to disincentivize hard work.

Let the legislator first not only define in genus but spell out in species what is shameful or honorable, and let him encourage his citizens by honors and deter them by punishments so as to maintain, in word and deed too, their right as individuals (*ius singulorum*). And [let him do so] with this stipulation, that they do not exceed unduly the wealth [appropriate to] individuals; for great wealth is not, as a rule, easily amassed

33 See my discussion in *Humanism and Platonism*, 1: 214–15.

34 *Comparatio* 1523, sign. R7r: "Nam sicut animalia bruta praesentium rerum phantasia uiuunt, sic homo rerum futurarum spe in vita sustentatur, estque hoc sibi sic proprium ut non difficil提高 facias aut non esse uisibile animal hominem aut non esse ciuile aut non esse capax disciplinae quam spem ab eo penitus tollas; quicquid enim horum abstuleris, hominem ipsum abstuleris necesse est."

without wickedness. But no one should ever be restrained by the laws from industriousness, which stimulates and enlarges human minds.³⁵

What, then, of the common good, the principle that was the guiding light of medieval and Renaissance political thought and practice?³⁶ Here George makes some of his most interesting (and libertarian-sounding) remarks. In effect, he removes the common good from the sphere of human life in this world and transfers it to the afterlife. This means that the ancient pagan political theorists (including Aristotle!) who made observing the common good the measure of a healthy constitution were trying to do something impossible. They were trying to find a principle of happiness among mutable and fallen things. But owing to individual differences it is never possible for human beings to agree on the nature of an earthly common good. Only Christians, thanks to the revealed teachings of Christ, know that in this life we have no abiding happiness.

Why hope was planted in mankind is a matter of high speculation which you and those like you could neither understand nor believe in, for in your [pagan] times, the Gentiles sensed not even the smallest spark of the True Hope. Your whole hope was placed in these fallen and mutable things. It could not be placed as a whole in a common thing, for there cannot be a common good or ultimate end for every person, unless everyone could share a single judgment and a single will, a thing it is most foolish even to imagine could exist in this life.³⁷

35 Ibid., sign. R6v: "Quid turpe, quid honestum sit in primis legislator non in genere solum diffiniat, verum etiam in spetie numeret atque distinguat, civesque non magis verbo quam opera ius singulorum tenere cum honoribus hortetur tum suppliciiis deterreat, hoc pacto nec opes singulorum nimium excedent – ingens enim pecunia non facile absque scelere solet accumulari – nec ullus ab industria, quae animos hominum excitat maioresque facit, legibus unquam revocabitur."

36 Matthew Kempshall, *The Common Good in Late Medieval Political Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). I have been unable to find a position similar to George's in this thorough and precise study.

37 *Comparatio* 1523, sign. R7r: "Qua re autem spes insita humano generi sit, altioris speculationis est, quam uel tu uel tui similes <non> possint aut intelligere aut [tua ed.] credere. Nam temporibus tuis nec scintillam quidem uerae spei gentes sentiebant, sed totam spem suam in caducis atque instabilibus his rebus collocabant. Ea in rem communem tota conferri non potest; non enim potest bonum commune ultimus<que> finis esse cuiusque, nisi omnes unius iudicii eiusdemque uoluntatis sint, quod in hac uita uel cogitare stultissimum est."

Human desires in this life are labile and restless; only in the next life (as Augustine taught) can they find rest in God, the real common good.

For the human mind cannot in this life remain content with the same things unless, as has been said, it translates itself in faith to another life. This is something that in your times, [Plato], was not even understood; nowadays many understand it, but few believe [in] it.³⁸

Since it is impossible to establish a common good in this life, since our happiness lies in the life to come, human beings in the here-and-now are left only with proper goods, which everyone must be free to choose for himself. And here is where George begins to sound very libertarian indeed. Since there is no common good on which all can agree, coercion in the realm of licit private ends and private goods will not lead to happiness and cannot be justified:

Necessarily then everyone who departs from the true end and the true good [which everyone does in this life, as George has argued] establishes each for himself according to his own judgment an end, and it is unfair and wicked for a legislator to remove him from this end unless it is a disgraceful one. He [the legislator] should not do so even if he adapts his laws to the true end. For that end is not to be chosen and obtained by force, but by freedom of the will. How much more iniquitous then is the man who uses laws to drag someone away from an end he has honorably set out for himself. I have established an end in literature, an end in medicine, an end in agriculture, an end in trade, and I hope therefrom merely that I shall have honor, income, peace, and eternal praise, and you [Plato] rob me of this hope by means of laws. You don't understand that if you take away my liberty, bringing despair instead, you are putting the noose around my neck. "But," you say, "I am offering you a better hope than the one you have fixed on for yourself." But why you, of all men? Isn't man free? What is this madness? Don't you see that judgments differ, that pleasures and pains differ? Perfectly honorable things which I find pleasant you snatch away from me and substitute things you find pleasant. You won't permit me to enjoy things I think to be goods, even if they are honorable, and the things you imagine to be good you would force me to enjoy. But no one enjoys what is forced upon him; enjoyment is a sign of

38 Ibid., sign. R7v–R8r: "Nam mens hominis in eisdem semper manere contenta in hac uita non potest, nisi, ut dictum est, ad aliam vitam fide se transferat, quid temporibus tuis ne intelligebatur quidem; nunc a plurimis intelligitur, sed a paucissimis creditur."

pleasure, but coerced enjoyment is not pleasant. Furthermore, there can be no pleasure where there is not liberty, but coercion and liberty are incompatible. Therefore coercion and pleasure are incompatible.³⁹

To sum up, then, the ends of our spiritual nature are set by God but belong to the next life; those of our bodily nature in this life are legitimately set by the individual and can't be dictated by another. That end is the *iucundum*, what is agreeable or pleasant to the senses, a term of art for George that embraces physical pleasure (*voluptas*) but also anything that our bodily nature finds attractive such as security and recognition by others. The ruler can constrain individual behavior only if it strays beyond the limits of what is right and honorable, but within those limits all attempts by government to control lives, to dictate what is *iucundum* – even in the name of high-sounding ideals – will be counter-productive. Partly this is a question of right: legislators and rulers in matters that are morally indifferent have no standing to impose their preferences; in such matters human beings should enjoy a certain autonomy. But the main reason why legislation will fail that attempts to coerce individuals towards a universal, philosophical ideal of happiness is the nature of coercion itself. Coercion is incompatible with happiness in this bodily state. You can't coerce someone into being happy; the *iucundum* is only *iucundum* if is an object embraced by free will; liberty is therefore a necessary condition of achieving our ends in this bodily life. Plato's belief that happiness can be mandated by a ruler's command or a legislator's law is a philosophical delusion.

39 Ibid., sign. R7r–v: “Necessario igitur omnes qui a uero fine ueroque bono aberrant proprium sibi quisque pro arbitrio suo constituunt finem, a quo nisi turpis sit, si ui legislator remouet, iniquus atque improbus est. Non si etiam ad uerum leges suas finem accommodaret; non enim ui, sed uoluntatis libertate ille finis et eligitur et acquiritur. Quanto igitur iniquior est qui a fine quemque suo sibi honeste proposito legibus euellit. Finem in litteratura, finem in medicina, finem in agricultura, finem in mercatura meum collocaui, speroque me inde solummodo honorem emolumenta quietem sempiternamque laudem habiturum, et tu legibus hanc mihi spem tollis nec intelligis si libertatem mihi abstuleris desperationemque attuleris, laquaeum quo gulam frangam mihi abs te offertur. ‘Sed pro hac tua,’ inquires, ‘spe quam tu tibi finxisti, meliorem ego tibi propono.’ Quid tu, homo omnium? Non est liber homo? Quae dementia haec est? Non uides aliud alii probari, aliud alii iucundum uideri? Aliud alii triste atque acerbum? Quae mihi iucunda sunt nec ullam turpitudinem habent, mihi eripiuntur et quae tibi iucunda sunt inculcantur? Quae mihi ego bona puto, iis non licebit frui etiamsi honesta sunt, et quae tu bona esse fingis, his coactus fruar? Fruitur quisque coactus minime; frui enim iucundum est, coactum uero iucundum esse non potest. Praeterea ubi libertas non est, ibi iucundum esse non potest, sed ubi coactio est, ibi libertas non est. Ubi ergo coactio est, ibi non est iucunditas.”

George's coercion argument, interestingly, bears a striking resemblance to Locke's liberal argument for toleration in the *Letter on Toleration*. Locke there makes the case that coercion is incompatible with true religion, because for religious belief to be genuine and vigorous, it has to be freely embraced; the mere act of coercion reduces the spiritual value of belief.⁴⁰ Coercion itself takes away the psychological state necessary to achieve the object of coercion.

George's libertarianism carries with it certain implications, some of which show that he cannot be classed simply as an Aristotelian without qualification. First, his denial that there can exist a common good acceptable to all who strive to flourish in this bodily life implies that there can be no basis for distinguishing good and bad constitutions on the Aristotelian model (*Politics* 3.4.7). This puts George closer to the camp of Machiavelli, who assesses the value of legislation in accordance with its ability to secure the wealth and power of a polity. Secondly, George's insistence on human freedom and autonomy within the limits of right presents a sharp contrast with the authoritarian character of Aristotle's own political theory.⁴¹ By vindicating freedom as the ability to live as you will within legal limits, he embraces what Aristotle and Renaissance theorists alike identify as the end of democrats under a popular constitution, an end that Aristotle regards as an inferior goal for a polity.⁴²

Of course it needs to be emphasized that there are enormous differences between George's conception of liberty and that of modern libertarians. In George's writings there is no trace of the harm principle so central to modern libertarianism since it was first codified by John Stuart Mill: that my freedom of action is limited only by the harm my actions might bring to others.⁴³ For

40 John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration*, ed. Ian Shapiro (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), esp. 219–232.

41 For many vivid examples of Aristotle's limits on personal freedoms, see Jonathan Barnes, "Aristotle and Political Liberty," in *Aristotle's Politics: Critical Essays*, ed. Richard Kraut and Steven Skultety (Lanham MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005), 185–202.

42 See Aristotle, *Politics* 3.7–8. Francesco Patrizi of Siena, the great humanist authority on political theory, similarly identifies the end of popular republics as the desire of the multitude to live as it wishes (*vivere ut uis*), unless what you want to do is constrained by force or right (*nisi quod vi aut iure prohibetur*); see his *De institutione rei publicae* (Paris: Galliotus Pratensis, 1534), VIII (1.4). (The definition of liberty is attributed to Cicero and to the second-century Roman juriconsult Florentinus.). The end of popular republics is distinguished from that of aristocratic republics (virtue) and of oligarchies (wealth).

43 John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty, with The Subjection of Women and Chapters on Socialism*, ed. Stefan Collini (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 13: "The sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power

George, as for most moralists of his time, one's freedom of action is bounded by natural law and natural right. Nor does George make any appeal to the libertarian idea of 'self-ownership,' a concept repugnant to Catholic ethics,⁴⁴ and incompatible with the Stoic belief in natural duties owed by human beings to each other – the latter being a foundational principle of humanist political thought.⁴⁵ On the other hand, George's praise of empires ancient and modern makes it unlikely that he would be sympathetic to the libertarian thesis that the authority of the state arises entirely through consent.

Despite these important differences, however, it is striking how successful George was in making an argument for personal autonomy and for limits on political coercion within a framework of Christian eudaimonism. Whether that argument is fully coherent is another question. In any case, like his arguments for cosmopolitan empire, George's libertarianism is to my knowledge unique among Renaissance humanists and without any discernible influence on later thinkers. Its uniqueness no doubt stems from George's unusual self-positioning as the eternal outsider, the prophet of a future cosmopolitan empire, and an implacable foe of Plato's philosophy. Nevertheless, George's example shows, I believe, that the common view that sees libertarianism as intrinsically modern, as a way of thought dependent on a particular *wirkungsgeschichtliches Bewusstsein*, cannot be entirely correct. George clearly had an understanding of liberty, autonomy and coercion distinct from those of the traditions he inhabited: distinct from ancient status-concepts of liberty, from freedom in the philosophical sense of rational control over passions and appetites, and from liberty in the late medieval and Renaissance sense of 'non-domination.' George's concept of liberty as a personal freedom to set and pursue any morally licit end, free of direction or coercion from governments, shows that the horizons of premodern liberty are broader than our current narratives of the history of political thought may allow.

can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant."

- 44 See the section on "Self-ownership" in Peter Vallentyne, "Libertarianism," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2012 Edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta, URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2012/entries/libertarianism/>>. For a discussion of the incompatibility of libertarian self-ownership with Catholic/Christian conceptions of natural law see Edward Feser, "Classical Natural Law Theory, Property Rights and Taxation," *Social Philosophy and Policy* 27, 1 (2010): 21–52.
- 45 I discuss this principle in my forthcoming study of humanist political theory, *The Virtue Politics of the Italian Humanists*.

The School of San Lorenzo, Niccolò Machiavelli, Paolo Sassi, and Benedetto Riccardini

Robert Black

Before the thirteenth century, medieval Italian (including Tuscan) school education was dominated by the church, but the triumph of the communes led to the rapid decline of ecclesiastical schools, which became relative rarities in fourteenth-century Italy.¹ Florence was no exception: by 1301 the premises of the Florentine cathedral school had been demolished,² and during the fourteenth century convents such as the Carmine, S. Trinità and S.M. Novella regularly brought in laymen to teach grammar to their novices.³ The decline of ecclesiastical education had serious implications for the training of the clergy: secular grammar schools and teachers did not provide for musical and liturgical instruction, with the result that there was a shortage of boy choristers and officiants by the fifteenth century. Pope Eugenius IV addressed the problem with the foundation or refoundation of cathedral schools at Turin, Tortona, Pistoia, Bologna, Treviso, Mileto, Padua, Castiglione Olona, Urbino, Verona, Venice and Catania.⁴ The situation was particularly acute in Florence, where weakened musical and liturgical education was compounded by a sharp decline in Latin learning at the school level. In Florence by the early fifteenth century grammar (i.e. Latin: grammar was a synonym for Latin) schools had been supplanted by schools of commercial arithmetic, the so-called abacus schools, as the dominant form of secondary education: in early Quattrocento Florence, Latin education was suffering a severe decline – more so than elsewhere in Italy.⁵ It is significant that, when Eugenius IV refounded the Florentine cathedral school by papal bull in 1436 and 1441, he explicitly

1 Robert Black, *Education and Society in Florentine Tuscany. Teachers, Pupils and Schools, c. 1250–1500*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), ch. 3.

2 Robert Davidsohn, *Storia di Firenze*, tr. Eugenio Dupré-Theseider, 8 vols. (Florence: Sansoni, 1956–68), VII, 227–28.

3 Black, *Education*, 187–89.

4 Osvaldo Gambassi, “*Pueri Cantores*” *nelle cattedrali d’Italia tra medioevo e età moderna* (Florence: Olschki, 1997).

5 Black, *Education*, ch. 5.

highlighted the goal of increasing the number of clerks “learned in Latin” (*dictam ecclesiam [sc. Florentinam] in clericorum [...] grammatica peritorum numero adaugere*).⁶ The Eugenian foundations encouraged extra-cathedral establishments in the Quattrocento too: Tuscan examples are church schools at Empoli and Prato. The city of Florence witnessed a spate of new and refounded ecclesiastical schools during the fifteenth century at, for example, the Badia Fiorentina, S. Pancrazio, S. Salvi, S. Pier Maggiore, S.M. Novella, S.M. del Carmine, S. Ambrogio, SS. Annunziata and S.M. degli Angeli.⁷

The most important of the Florentine extra-cathedral church schools was at S. Lorenzo. Under Cosimo de’ Medici’s auspices, a teacher was appointed at S. Lorenzo on 11 March 1459 to teach twelve young clerks, who were to officiate at religious services under the latter’s supervision.⁸ Provision for their maintenance and payment soon followed. Since local ecclesiastical authorities were then considering the suppression of the hospital of S. Bartolomeo a Mugnone, outside the city walls at the Porta al Prato, Cosimo intervened, proposing the partial diversion of the hospital’s income to support the new school at S. Lorenzo, to whose parish the hospital belonged, with the remainder of the revenues reverting to the neighbouring nunnery of S. Martino a Mugnone. Cosimo secured the offices of his cousin, Filippo de’ Medici, bishop of Arezzo, to gain the required papal approval.⁹ The result was that Pius II issued a bull on 19 May 1459 establishing the school of S. Lorenzo and providing 120 florins from the hospital’s annual income for the education and maintenance of twelve clerks and for the payment of their teacher,¹⁰ who was charged with their instruction

6 Giovanni Lami, *Sanctae ecclesiae florentinae monumenta*, vol. II (Florence: ab Angelo Salutatae, 1758), 1147.

7 Robert Black, *Education and Society in Florentine Tuscany. Teachers, Pupils and Schools, c. 1250–1500*, vol. II, Leiden (forthcoming); Karl Schlebusch, ed. *Petrus Domitius: Augustinus. Eine christliche Komödie des 15. Jahrhunderts mit einer Einleitung erstmals herausgegeben* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992), 204–5.

8 Florence Archivio di San Lorenzo (henceforth ASL), 2200, fol. 19r; 2191, fol. 6r. Previously canons and chaplains of S. Lorenzo had sometimes given private reading lessons to boys, but on 15 February 1453 this practice was forbidden, except in the case of trainee clerks attached to a particular canon or chaplain: (ASL 2866, fol. 9r) “Partito non si può tenere fanciulli a leggere in chiostro. Ricordo come a dì 15 di febbraio [1453] si determinò in capitolo che nessuno canonico e cappellano risidente possa tenere nessuno fanciullo a leggere per casa fuori del cherico di ciascheduno.”

9 ASL 2381, fol. 7r. See Pär Larson, “La Scuola dei Chierici,” in *San Lorenzo. I documenti e i tesori nascosti*, ed. Marco Assirelli (Venice: Marsilio, 1993), 59.

10 The bull is published by Domenico Moreni, *Continuazione delle memorie storiche dell'Ambrosiana Imperial Basilica di S. Lorenzo di Firenze*, 2 vols. (Florence: Francesco Daddi,

in Latin (*grammatica*) and Gregorian chant (*canto fermo*);¹¹ the teacher was also obliged to teach other young clerks attached to S. Lorenzo's sacristy, prior and canons. The greater part of the school's annual income of 120 florins was divided between the teacher, who received approximately 34 florins a year as his salary (as well as an annual gratuity of a pair of capons),¹² and the twelve clerks, each of whom was given an allowance of about 5 1/2 florins a year; these salaries were paid in cash and in grain.¹³ The remaining 20 florins were presumably used for the upkeep of the school.

There were several notable teachers appointed in the fifteenth century. The first master was ser Antonio di Lotto da Montespertoli, an acolyte in minor orders, who began service on 11 March 1459. On 12 May 1459 he was elected by the Chapter to the stipendiary choral chapel of S. Stefano. His particular interest – unusual for a grammar teacher – was theology. On 10 January 1465 he began a course of lectures on Peter Lombard's First Book of Sentences at the Studio of Santissima Annunziata, part of the University of Florence's Faculty of Theology, following with the Second Book on 13 July 1468; two days later, he was awarded a doctorate in theology by the University. When he was elected to a canonry at S. Lorenzo in 1469, he resigned his teaching post. He became a deacon of the Florentine Faculty of Theology on 10 October 1480 and died on 22 June 1497.¹⁴

Antonio di Lotto's immediate successors were less memorable. Giuliano di Bartolomeo Tendi da Scarperia, who served from 24 February 1469 to 31 May 1478, eventually became a fervent follower of Savonarola.¹⁵ Piramo d'Antonio da Bruscoli, rector of the church of S. Chirico a Legnaia, had previous teaching experience in an ecclesiastical school, having been master of the clerks at

1816–17), II, 416–20. See also Moreni, *Continuazione*, I, 53–55; Larson, "La Scuola," 59. Further bulls and documentation of the school's foundation are summarized in ASL 2200, fols. 1r–18r.

11 ASL 2381, fol. 13r.

12 ASL 2381, fol. 16v.

13 ASL 2381, fol. 13r; 2200, fol. 20v.

14 ASL 2381, fols. 13r, 19r, 27r, 34r, 42r, 50r, 56r; 2200, fol. 83r; 2391, fol. 39r; Pier Nolasco Cianfogni, *Memorie istoriche dell'Ambrosiana R. Basilica di S. Lorenzo di Firenze*, ed. Domenico Moreni (Florence: Domenico Ciardetti, 1804), 251–52; Moreni, *Continuazione*, I, 53–54, 57, and II, 331; Celestino Piana, *La facoltà teologica dell'Università di Firenze nel Quattro e Cinquecento* (Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1977), 185, 323, 346, 474; Paolo Viti, ed., *Il capitolo di San Lorenzo nel Quattrocento* (Florence: Olschki, 2006), 18, 36, 224, 229, 311.

15 ASL 2381, fols. 66v, 74r, 80v, 84r, 88r, 93r, 98v, 105r; 2200, fol. 83r–v; 2191, fol. 39r–v; Cianfogni, *Memorie*, 235; Viti, *Il capitolo*, 225, 239; Moreni, *Continuazione*, I, 57–58.

S. Ambrogio in Florence; he served at S. Lorenzo from 25 May 1478 until his death on 23 July 1479, when he bequeathed books (including three theological incunables) to the Laurentian chapter library.¹⁶ The following teacher, Tommaso di Stefano, appointed on 20 October 1479, served less than a year, incurring dismissal on 31 August 1480.¹⁷ The next appointment was more felicitous: Giovanni Domenico d'Antonio di Francesco Dell'Azzuro, described as a *strenuo e virtuoso giovane*,¹⁸ was elected on 29 August 1480 (but see Addendum below, 133), beginning service the following 1 September, and teaching for over three years until 1 January 1484, when he became a Florentine communal schoolmaster, serving in that capacity until 1492; he also became a priest at Orsanmichele.¹⁹

The following master at S. Lorenzo was more notable. Paolo di Antonio Sassi da Ronciglione, who taught for seven months from 1 January to 31 July 1484,²⁰ had made his first prominent appearance on the Florentine educational scene in 1480 (but see Addendum below, 133), when appointed one of the communal schoolmasters, serving in that capacity until his departure for S. Lorenzo. While working as Florentine communal schoolmaster he became a grammar teacher of the famous Niccolò di messer Bernardo Machiavelli on 5 November 1481.²¹ He was also the Latin master of humanists, including Pietro Crinito and Michele Verino (whose posthumously published edition of distichs were dedicated by his father Ugolino to Sassi), as well as of the famous amateur humanist statesman, Francesco Vettori.²² A manuscript exercise book in Latin prose

16 ASL 2381, fols. 105r, 110r; 2200, fol. 83v; 2191, fol. 39v; Moreni, *Continuazione*, I, 58; Viti, *Il capitolo*, 135, 245 n. 87 (in this book Piramo is consistently misidentified as "Pietro di Piramo Bruscoli").

17 ASL 2381, fols. 110r, 116v; 2200, fol. 83v; 2191, fol. 39v; Moreni, *Continuazione*, I, 58.

18 ASL 2200, fol. 83v.

19 ASL 2381, fols. 116v, 123v, 130v, 137v ("rinuntio a detta scuola, electo maestro del comune nel quartiere di Santo Spirito", 141v); 2191, fol. 39v; 2200, fol. 83v; Moreni, *Continuazione*, I, 58; Armando Verde, *Lo studio fiorentino*, 6 vols. (Florence and Pistoia: Olschki, 1973–1995), II, 390–91; Black, *Education*, 399, 542.

20 ASL 2381, fols. 137v, 141v, 144v; 2200, fol. 83v; 2191, fol. 39v; Moreni, *Continuazione*, I, 58–59.

21 Robert Black, "New Light on Machiavelli's Education," in *Niccolò Machiavelli: Politico, storico, letterato*, ed. Jean-Jacques Marchand (Rome: Salerno, 1996), 392 (now reprinted in Robert Black, *Studies in Renaissance Humanism and Politics. Florence and Arezzo* [Farnham Surrey: Ashgate, 2011], VIII, 392).

22 Black, *Education*, 361, 398; Felix Gilbert, *Machiavelli and Guicciardini. Politics and History in Sixteenth-Century Florence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), 321; Francesco Bausi, *Machiavelli* (Rome: Salerno, 2005) 29; Rosemary Devonshire Jones, *Francesco Vettori. Florentine Citizen and Medici Servant* (London: Continuum, 1972), 7; Andrea Guidi, *Un segretario militante. Politica, diplomazia e armi nel Cancelliere Machiavelli* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2009), 55 ff; Alfonso Lazzari, *Ugolino e Michele Verino. Studi biografici e critici*

composition consisting of short passages in the vernacular followed by translations into Latin was written by Crinito, while attending Paolo Sassi's school.²³ In his diary, Bernardo Machiavelli said that his son Niccolò was learning to do translations from the vernacular into Latin (*Niccolò fa de' latini*) at Paolo Sassi's school,²⁴ and so it is more than credible that Machiavelli himself followed a curriculum similar to Crinito's under the same teacher. It is significant that pupils are recommended there to follow the lead of Cicero and Terence.²⁵ This evidence offers a precious insight into the curriculum at S. Lorenzo, where Paolo Sassi doubtless also taught the clerks Latin prose composition on the basis of translations from the vernacular, besides reading with them classical authors such as Terence and Cicero. After leaving S. Lorenzo, Sassi eventually went on to teach at the Florentine Cathedral School beginning in 1491.²⁶

(Turin: Clausen, 1897), 115; Verde, *Lo studio*, IV, 534–37; Ugolino Verino, *Epigrammi*, ed. Francesco Bausi (Messina: Sicania, 1998), 107–8; Viti, *Il capitolo*, 222.

- 23 Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, MS 2621, fols. 2r–39r. The exercises were written by the future humanist and pupil of Poliziano's, Pietro Crinito, who himself dated the book to the years 1486–1490: see fol. 1r (“Hic liber est mei Petri Bartolomei de Ricciis anno domini MCCCCLXXXVI, MCCCCLXC.”) Each of the vernacular passages for translation is headed with the name “Paulus Roncilionensis” written by Crinito. Also see Guidi, *Un segretario*, 55 ff.
- 24 Black, “New light,” 392, 397–98.
- 25 Guidi, *Un segretario*, 68. This passage is inaccurately and misleadingly transcribed by Guidi at 67–68. The correct transcription is as follows: “De' di' mmi, Francesco, credi tu che noi habiamo a diventare docti solo odendo le lectione et non componendo mai alcuna cosa? Non che nol credo et la ragione è questa: ognuno el quale è stato stimato docto et ha composto qualche cosa afferma che l'arte del dire senza l'exercitatione vale pocho, imperochè se uno non se exercita et sforzasi essere simile a alcuno nel dire, pocho gli giova l'arte, né anchora si stima che lui intenda se non si vede qualche cosa composta da lui, et accioché noi componiamo bene, bisogna che noi intendiamo l'arte et nel lei se exercitiamo et consequitiamo Cicerone ho Terentio ho alcuno simile a questi se vogliano consequitare l'ornamento del dire” (Florence Biblioteca Riccardiana MS 2621, fol. 24r). Guidi read “Lucrezio” instead of the correct “ho Terentio”, a serious mistake since it might, on that basis, have been thought that he was already exposed, at Paolo Sassi's school, to an author whom he later transcribed. Guidi also described the passage “bisogna che noi intendiamo l'arte et nel lei se exercitiamo” as containing “una lacuna per errore” (68 n. 76), whereas there is no lacuna; he was evidently unable to transcribe or understand the words “et nel lei” reading instead “nelle . . . se esercitiamo”, whereas it is clear that the text means “it is necessary that we understand the art of discourse and to it [nel lei] we devote practice.”
- 26 Giuseppe Richa, *Notizie istoriche delle chiese fiorentine*, vol. VI (Florence: Viviani, 1757), 106; Florence Biblioteca Moreniana MS 200¹, fol. 132v.

There has been a controversy over the past decade regarding Paolo Sassi's morals. In the *Corriere della sera* on 11 November 2005 an interview was published with William Connell, who suggested that Machiavelli might have been molested at school by Paolo Sassi. Connell cited as evidence the famous letter written by Francesco Vettori to Machiavelli on 16 January 1515,²⁷ suggesting that both he and Machiavelli had been molested by a teacher. Francesco Bausi replied to the charges,²⁸ agreeing that Machiavelli had had *un probabile amore omossessuale*,²⁹ but denying that Machiavelli had been molested by Sassi, whom he exonerated as the *buon ser Paolo*³⁰ on the grounds that Connell had no concrete evidence against Sassi and that Sassi's reputation and character were beyond reproach. Connell backtracked in 2009, admitting that his earlier claim had been a "pure and simple hypothesis."³¹ As it turns out, Connell was right and Bausi wrong. Sassi was a paedophile, who would be summarily dismissed from his post as grammar master in the Florentine cathedral school at the end of January 1495, evidently for violating a pupil or pupils in the cathedral choir, access to which he was henceforth forbidden even if called there in the course of teaching duties. I discovered these new facts in hitherto unknown archival documents of the Florentine cathedral chapter:

Florence, Archivio del Capitolo Metropolitano Fiorentino, Partiti e deliberazioni, 1 [scaffale A-14], a. 1467–a. 1504.

Fol. 164r: [In margin:] Pro ser Paulo de Ronciglione

Die 25 ianuarii 1494. [...] Canonici [...] fecerunt quod duos [sic] de capitulo qui remanserint per plures fabas nigras habeant auctoritatem potestatem et baliam quam habet totum capitulum circa cassationem ser Pauli de Ronciglione ad presens magistri in scolasticaria clericorum dicte ecclesie, qui etiam possint una cum domino vicario et consulibus artis lane cassare predictum ser Paulum et alium cum prefatis eligere dummodo nequeant consentire in electione ser Petri Domitii alias del Comandatore; si aliter fecerint intelligitur irritum et vanum, promittentes ratum et firmum habere qui[c]quid per predictos duos gestum fatuum fuerit. Item in continenti fuerunt fatti commissarii omnibus canonicis

27 Niccolò Machiavelli, *Lettere*, ed. Franco Gaeta (Turin: UTET, 1984), 486–8, at 486–7.

28 Francesco Bausi, "Machiavelli molestato? (in difesa di ser Paolo Sassi)," *Interpres* 24 (2005): 266–71.

29 *Ibid.*, 267.

30 *Ibid.*, 270.

31 William J. Connell, "Le molestie del Machiavelli," *Interpres* 28 (2009): 266–7.

missis ad partitum per plures fabas nigras de lo sì dominus Lodovicus de Martellis et dominus Matheus de Rabatta.

Fol. 164v: [In margin:] Privatio ser Pauli de Ronciglione

Die 28 ianuarii 1494. [...]

Canonici prefati capituli, certis et rationiabilibus causis eorum animum moventibus, et obtento partito inter ipsos per tres tertios ipsorum etcetera etc. privaverunt ser Paulum de Ronciglione ad presens magistrum scolasticharie dicte ecclesie de omnibus distributionibus tam ordinariis quam extraordinariis et dederunt auctoritatem domino Lodovico de Martellis et Matheo de Rabatta ut nomine capituli se conferant ad dominum vicarum ut in vultu dicti capituli legat censuris et penis prefatum ser Paulum ut nullo modo ingrediatur corum dicte ecclesie tamquam magistrali licentia. Hoc habet auctoritatem quam habet totum capitulum, promittens ratum et firmum habere etc. [...]

Sassi's paedophilia is highlighted in the above documents by the reference to Pietro Domizi, himself a notorious paedophile, who was explicitly excluded as a possible replacement for Sassi. Whether or not Machiavelli was actually molested by Sassi is still uncertain, although it may be suggestive that both he and Vettori were pupils of Sassi's, and, in Vettori's letter to Machiavelli on 16 January 1515, Vettori seems to be alluding to a common experience.

Sassi's successor was Paolo di Giovanni Comparini da Prato, who taught the clerks of S. Lorenzo from 9 August 1484 until 31 January 1488, having resigned on the previous 23 January.³² Well known as a friend and correspondent of Poliziano's, his principal claim to fame was his role in furthering the revival of Latin comedy in the fifteenth century. In fact, his former clerical pupils at S. Lorenzo staged a performance of Plautus's *Menaechmi* in the presence of Lorenzo the Magnificent on 12 May 1488. For this occasion, Comparini's friend Poliziano composed a prologue in Latin verse, taking to task earlier humanist Latin theatrical efforts, which had been written in prose, as well as ridiculing the hypocritical criticisms of contemporary mendicants directed against the performance of pagan comedies. Poliziano attributed the contents of his prologue to Comparini, who may well have been the source for the defence of secular theatrical performances by schoolboys.³³ In fact, Comparini was far from puritanical in his own conduct and in his demeanour towards pupils. On

32 ASL 2381, fols. 144v, 147r, 154v, 162r, 168v–169r.

33 On this performance and Poliziano's prologue, see Paola Ventrone, "La pedagogia teatrale di Pietro Domizi" in *Atti del VII centenario del Duomo di Firenze. Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Firenze, 16–21 giugno 1997)*, ed. Timothy Verdon and Annalisa Innocenti, 5 vols.

25 July 1494, he was censured for “secular conversations and practices in his room” (*sospette conversationi, et exercitii secolareschi si fanno nella camera di ser Pagolo Comparini da Prato*), ordered to remove therefrom “perfumes, boxes, mirrors, brushes and all other worldly items” (*profummi, et cassette, et specchi, setole, et d’ogni altra cosa da exercitio secolaresco*), and forbidden from receiving or teaching pupils or any other suspicious or extraneous persons there (*né in decta camera non possa tenere scolari, né insegnare, né fare insegnare, né in decta camera possa menare, o raceptare alcuna persona di suspecto, né ancora forestieri*).³⁴ All this has a Savonarolan flavour – the *frateschi* constituted a forceful current in S. Lorenzo during the 1490s³⁵ – and yet Comparini’s foppery and implied homosexuality, detailed with such specificity, can hardly have been invented. After the fall of Savonarola and his affinity, Comparini continued to collect benefices and preferments, dying during an outbreak of plague on 2 July 1524.³⁶

The next two teachers at S. Lorenzo were mediocrities: Girolamo di Zanobi, priest at the Florentine church of S. Michele Visdomini, who served from 1 February 1488 to 28 February 1491,³⁷ and Simone d’Agnolo da Fucecchio, from 1 March 1491 to 31 December 1494.³⁸ The latter’s successor, however, was no nonentity. Pietro di Domenico Domizi (“del Comandatore”) (b. 1446 and noted as a *cherico* aged 23 in 1469),³⁹ who had himself been a clerk in Florence’s cathedral school,⁴⁰ was an experienced teacher, having served, following Lorenzo the Magnificent’s recommendation,⁴¹ in Pistoia as communal

(Florence: Edifir, 2001), I, *La cattedrale e la città. Saggi sul Duomo di Firenze*, 525–37, at 526–7.

34 Moreni, *Continuazione*, I, 59.

35 See Viti, *Il capitolo*, 19, 239–40, 273–292 *passim*.

36 Giovanni Parenti s.v. “Comparini Paolo,” in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, xxvii (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1982), 682–84, refers to the relevant published literature as well as archival sources.

37 ASL 2381, fol. 169r; 2461, fol. 4v; 2200, fol. 84r; 2191, fol. 40r; Moreni, *Continuazione*, I, 62.

38 ASL 2461, fols. 4v, 10v, 16v, 23v, 27v; 2200, fol. 84r; 2191, fol. 40r; Moreni, *Continuazione*, I, 62.

39 Schlebusch, *Petrus Domitius*, 192.

40 Florence, Archivio di stato (henceforth ASF), Mediceo avanti il principato, 24.294 (Domizi to Lorenzo de’ Medici, 4.12.1472): “siquid de preceptore (scis autem, de quo dicam) artis lanae consules facere statuerunt, tu unicus patronus meam queso causam suscipias, ita tamen, ut nemini inferatur iniuria. Ego vero ea ratione id petere statui, quod in eo loco [Schlebusch, *Petrus Domitius*: meo loco] a primis annis et a cunabulis ad hunc usque diem observantia haud in omnes parva versatus [Schlebusch: versatur] mirifice illum litterarum ludum diligo.” This transcription corrects several mistakes in Schlebusch’s edition, 194–95.

41 Schlebusch, *Petrus Domitius*, 193.

grammarian from 1472 to 1473, as master of the clerks in the Florentine cathedral from 1473 until 1479 (or the very beginning of 1480), as private tutor to the Florentine Buongirolami family in 1479, as communal grammar teacher in Florence from 1482 to 1486 (or the very start of 1487), as teacher of the monks in the Florentine cloister of S. Maria degli Angeli in 1491, and as a private tutor in Florence in 1492 and 1493.⁴² Domizi organized performances of Latin comedies in the Florentine church of Ogni Santi and at the Medici Palace in 1478 and 1479; he was also the author of at least four Latin plays, of which three – taking episodes from the lives of early Christian saints as their subjects – have survived:⁴³ it is possible, with their far-from neo-classical content, style and form, that they were the intended target of Poliziano's abuse in the prologue to *Menaechmi* (see above, 113). However, Domizi's record was scarcely blameless: in June 1474 he was accused of repeatedly sodomizing his pupils (although he was absolved of the offence by the Florentine Ufficiali di Notte);⁴⁴ in June 1477, accused of unspecified improper behaviour, he was defended by the nuns of S. Maria in Prato, on whose behalf he acted as spiritual adviser and secular representative;⁴⁵ in December 1486 he was dismissed from his post as Florentine public grammar teacher by the Ufficiali dello Studio, *advertentes ad mores Petri Domitii magistri grammatices*;⁴⁶ in November 1491 the General of the Camaldolese Order, Pietro Delfino, asked for his dismissal from his post as teacher in S. Maria degli Angeli, with allusions to lack of innocence and dubious morality (*Male ibi haerere consuevit innocentia, ubi deest in vita et moribus docentis discentisque concordia*).⁴⁷ Nevertheless, Domizi enjoyed powerful protectors, including Lucrezia Tornabuoni, mother of Lorenzo the Magnificent,⁴⁸ and Lorenzo himself, who secured Domizi's first teaching post in Pistoia and who evidently intervened repeatedly on his behalf in other circumstances.⁴⁹ So it is not entirely surprising that, when the mastership at S. Lorenzo fell vacant with the resignation of Simone da Fucecchio, Domizi was appointed with effect from 1 January 1495.⁵⁰ While at S. Lorenzo, Domizi distinguished himself as Lenten preacher in 1495, but before long he succumbed to

42 Ibid., 1–4.

43 Ibid., 5–16.

44 Black, *Education*, 349.

45 Schlebusch, *Petrus Domitius*, 196–7.

46 Ibid., 201.

47 Ibid., 205.

48 Ibid., 2 n. 11, 196–7.

49 Ibid., 2ff., 6–8, 10ff., 13, 15, 193–5, 197, 203.

50 ASL 2461, fol. 27v.

his less than worthy proclivities. On 24 January 1498 he was dismissed from his post at S. Lorenzo by the Chapter, apprised of his misconduct:

avendo el nostro capitolo certa relatione d'alcuno difetto non molto honesto né buono di messer Piero del Comandatore maestro della scuola de' nostri cherici col partito vinto delle fave nere lo privammo del magistero. [In margin:] Privatione di messer Piero del Comandatore per mala relatione e fulli fatto torto.⁵¹

Again Domizi's connections seem to have stood him in good stead: less than a month later, he was absolved of sins of the flesh, either with women or men, laity or ecclesiastics, by the Florentine archbishop's vicar. For several years thereafter Domizi remained without a teaching post, but yet again lofty connections served him well: recommended by Piero Soderini, Florence's life gonfalonier of justice, to whom he had dedicated one of his Latin comedies, Domizi secured appointment in Prato as the town's principal grammar master, serving there for nearly ten years until the end of 1513, when, now on the recommendation of Lorenzo de' Medici, future duke of Urbino, he took up a teaching post in Pistoia, where he remained in service until his death on 29 December 1518.⁵²

Domizi's replacement beginning on 25 January 1498⁵³ was Benedetto di Piero di Benedetto Riccardini,⁵⁴ known as *Benedictus Philologus*,⁵⁵ the last

51 ASL 2461, fol. 24v. See Schlebusch, *Petrus Domitius*, 207, for a slightly shorter and different transcription.

52 Schlebusch, *Petrus Domitius*, 1–6, 193–99, 201, 203–12, 214–17, 223–26, 229, 233–36, 241–42; Paolo Procaccioli, s.v. “Domizi del Commendatore Pietro,” in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, XL (1991), 701–2; Moreni, *Continuazione*, I, 62. Domizi was reappointed to the school of S. Lorenzo on 23 January 1516, but declined the appointment, preferring to remain in Pistoia (ASL 2181, fol. 119r, 120r).

53 ASL 2461, fol. 32v; Riccardini was chosen as Domizi's successor the previous day: ASL 2366, fol. 63v. Riccardini was first appointed as “substi[tu]to” (ASL 2366, fol. 63v) and then, little more than a month later on 27 February, was given a normal appointment like all previous teachers: *ibid.* Carlo Dionisotti, *Machiavellerie* (Turin: Einaudi, 1980), 243 n. 4, overlooks the Florentine dating system, ascribing the beginning of Riccardini's appointment to 1497.

54 Riccardini identifies himself as “Benedecto di Piero di Benedecto” in ASL 2461, fol. 81v and as “Benedeto di Piero di Benedecto Ricardini” on fol. 84r, 87r.

55 Angelo Maria Bandini, *De Florentina luntarum Typographia eiusque censoribus: ex qua Graeci, Latini, Tusci scriptores ope codicum manuscriptorum a viris clarissimis pristinae integritati restituti in lucem prodierunt: accedunt excerpta uberrima praefationum libris singulis praemissarum* (Lucca: Bonsignori, 1791), 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 18, 20.

fifteenth-century teacher at S. Lorenzo. The writer of a letter to Bernardo Michelozzi, who was a canon of the Florentine cathedral,⁵⁶ on 29 September 1494 was identified as “Benedetto (Riccardini?)”.⁵⁷ The letter was, in fact, written by Benedetto Riccardini, as is clear from a comparison of its handwriting and the pages of the records of S. Lorenzo written by Riccardini himself while Camarlingo of the school from 1 June 1505 to 24 December 1506.⁵⁸ This letter also suggests that Riccardini would have been born sometime between

56 See Eve Borsook, “The Travels of Bernardo Michelozzi and Bonsignore Bonsignori in the Levant (1497–98),” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 36 (1973): 145–197, at 148: “Bernardo [Michelozzi] was a talented pupil and friend of Ficino’s. Poliziano praised him as ‘doctus utraque lingua vir’ and as such Bernardo was a Latin tutor to Lorenzo de’ Medici’s children. Bernardo was a cleric and canon of Florence Cathedral (as was Ficino) and eventually he became a *cameriere segreto* and *referendario apostolico* to his former pupil, Giovanni de’ Medici, when he became Pope Leo X. In 1489 at the instance of Rinieri Guicciardini he became a cathedral canon [...] Bernardo [...] wrote poetry and a *lacrimatoria* on the death of his patron, Lorenzo de’ Medici. Bernardo accompanied the young Giovanni de’ Medici to Rome and for a time became his secretary. In 1516, Bernardo was appointed Bishop of Forlì; Leo X made him *cameriere segreto* and *referendario apostolico*; he died in March 1519.”

57 Tammaro De Marinis and Alessandro Perosa, *Nuovi documenti per la storia del rinascimento raccolti e pubblicati da Tammaro De Marinis ed Alessandro Perosa* (Florence: Olschki, 1970), 86.

58 Cf. Tavola 35 in De Marinis and Perosa, *Nuovi documenti*, with ASL 2461, fol. 81r: “Riveduta l’entrata et l’uscita del presente libro da c. 68 insino c. 80 per me ser Benedecto di Piero di Benedecto maestro della scuola et camarlingo deputato per uno anno proximo ad venire cominciando a di primo di giugno 1505 tenuto per maestro Domenico Beniveni camarlingo di San Lorenzo et camarlingo per anni dua passati truovo esser più l’uscita che l’entrata lire cinque et soldi 5 D. 2 et di tanto si pone creditore. L. 5. S. 5. D. 2 [...] fol. 81v: Tenuto dalla presente carta c. 81 insino c. spatium per me Benedecto di Piero canonico et maestro di Sancto Lorenzo di Firenze deputato dal priore et capitolo di decia chiesa incominciando a di primo di giugno 1505 nel quale si scriverà tutta l’entrata et uscita del maestro et de’ dodici cherici scripti di decia chiesa.”

The secure identification of the “Benedictus” of the 1494 letter with Riccardini was first made by Francesco Lo Monaco, “Un Macrobio annotato da Benedetto Riccardini” *Studi umanistici* 4–5 (1993), 299–305, on the basis of Riccardini’s Greek ownership note in an incunabular edition of Macrobius (Brescia 1483) now preserved in Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale (henceforth BNCf), shelf mark B 3 25; the annotations in the book are in Riccardini’s hand. Lo Monaco mistranscribed the ownership note (at 301), omitting the preposition ἐκ [sic], which actually reads βενεδικτου του ἐκ ρικαδινων κτήμα και των φίλων. I am grateful to Davide Baldi for confirming my transcription.

1430 and 1450.⁵⁹ He was a follower of Poliziano's, as is clear from the letter to Michelozzi, where he declares that, with the death of Poliziano, he has lost his *rectorem, magistrum*.⁶⁰ Riccardini wrote an earlier letter, hitherto unknown, to Bernardo Michelozzi, dated 14 November 1491: in it he apologizes to Michelozzi

59 A search of Florentine archival sources, including the Catasto and the Libri di età, Decima Repubblicana, Carte Ancisa, Poligrafo Gargani and Baptismal Records in the Opera del Duomo has failed to reveal Riccardini's date of birth; the search was conducted both under the surname "Riccardini" and under the names "Benedetto di Piero di Benedetto." John Padgett kindly searched his numerous databases for Florentines up to 1500, with similar negative results. Riccardini repeatedly identifies himself as a Florentine in his editions for Giunti: see William A. Pettas, *The Giunti of Florence. A Renaissance Printing and Publishing Family. A History of the Florentine Firm and a Catalogue of the Editions* (New Castle DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2013), 223, 225; Bandini, *De Florentina*, 11, 4, 6, 7, 13, 18, 20. He refers to himself as a member of the Riccardini family as early as 24 November 1493, when he dated, on a note now glued to the inside back cover, the beginning of his annotation of the Macrobius edition cited above ("die 24 novembris 1493. die 4 mensis ianuarii hoc opus recensui, hora sextadecima"; this is also written in Riccardini's hand – cf. "4" in Riccardini's accounts in ASL 2461, fol. 82r – and is contemporaneous with the Greek ownership note, written as it is in the same dark ink). A possible inference is that Benedetto Riccardini was not actually a member of the Riccardini family, but assimilated himself to this Florentine family, possibly as a private tutor (in the manner of Agostino Vespucci / Netucci: see the forthcoming study by Gerard González Germain). This hypothesis is supported by the fact that Benedetto Riccardini mentions no member of the Riccardini family in his will, naming as his residual heirs a niece and another woman, both without surnames: see below n. 101.

Riccardini's autograph letter to Michelozzi, is, according to Gabriella Pomaro, written in *scrittura corsiva all'antica* and is not a true *italica*, making it improbable for Riccardini to have learned to write after 1460, and likely that he did so before; he would have been born as early as 1430 but no later than 1450.

60 De Marinis and Perosa, *Nuovi documenti*, 29: "Benedictus domino Bernardo [*Michelozzi*], Iohannis reverendissimi cardinalis secretario dignissimo salutem. Iacturam gravissimam fero, nam iactura dicenda est tanti viri amissio. Obiit aut in extremis laborat Angelus Politianus, omnium doctissimus, tui meique amantissimus et benevolus; quod dolorem meum adeo exulcerat, ut ipse qui sim, utrum sim an non sim, id quoque nesciam. O infelicem sub iniquo sydere natus: cogito enim quo amico, quo viro caream; quare tanquam iuvenis et fortissimi morte doleo: doleo autem, licet me imbecillum putes. Amisi enim, amisi mea vitae testem rectorem, magistrum, animae dimidium meae. Itaque tu mihi curarum requies

effice ne macies pallentes occupet artus,

nec notet informis pallida membra color. [Tib. 4, 4, 5–6]

Vale. Die 29 septembris 1494." Riccardini's preface to his edition of Terence (Florence 1505; see Bandini *De Florentina*, 11, 18) does not contain the information that he was a follower of Poliziano's, but only that he drew on Poliziano's work on Terence in preparing

for the delay in sending him a copy of Suetonius's lives of the emperors, a book that had not yet been returned to him by another friend, Agostino Vespucci (Netucci),⁶¹ tutor to Giovanni di messer Guidantonio Vespucci; these three—Riccardini, Michelozzi, and Vespucci/Netucci⁶²—all are linked as pupils / colleagues of Poliziano. Riccardini's early life is almost entirely unknown, but by about 1480, he emerges as a grammar teacher in Florence. In 1510, Filippo Giunti published a posthumous edition of a Latin grammar entitled *Erudimenta grammatices latinae linguae* by Riccardini.⁶³ This is a standard secondary-level textbook of Latin syntax, like those produced by Perotti, followed by a manual of epistolary style similar to Perotti's. The original text by Riccardini was dedicated to *Nicolao et Alexandro Machiavellis iunioribus*, whose instruction, so he said, he was about to undertake.⁶⁴ There are no brothers

his own edition: (despite William A. Pettas, *The Giunti of Florence. Merchant Publishers of the Sixteenth Century* [San Francisco: Bernard M. Rosenthal, 1980], 40).

- 61 BNCf, Ginori Conti, 29.54.15, at 30–31: “Reverende pater, post multas commendationes etc. Si me peccasse tibi denegarem, sane mentirer. At vero peccatum meum venia dignum est: quandoquidem Suetonium quem ad te quam celerrime missurum eram, Augustinus, magister Ioannis Vespucci, Vulpariae possidebat. Itaque opus servit ut suum aspectarem adventum. Quapropter non mihi sed illi danda est culpa. Preterea pergrave est mihi desiderium tui, nec sine summa molestia atque dolore tuam fero absentiam, maximeque quando mente concipio et revolve quantam voluptatem ex tua consuetudine capiebam, quamque mirificos fructus ab eadem legebam. Adeoque non mihi facile esset litterulis nostris sive potius libello tibi posse declarare. Qua de re oro et obtestor te, ut tu impertias nos tuis litteris quam doctissimis ut, ubi non tecum conversari possum saltem fruar illis, adeoque ne videar omnino tui carere, sed loquar tecum saepe legendo tuas. Vale dulce meum decus atque praesidium. Nos autem bene valemus.

Die decimo quarto novembris 1491. Tuus, tuus inquam, servulus Benedictus Florentiae. [verso] Utriusque linguae doctori domino Bernardo de Michelozis canonico dignissimo cathedralis ecclesiae Florentinae mihi observandissimo.

I am grateful to Gerard González Germain for referring me to this letter.

- 62 For Vespucci /Netucci as a pupil of Poliziano, see Verde, *Lo studio fiorentino*, III, 114.
- 63 I shall cite the copy in Padua Biblioteca Universitaria, shelf mark 105.b.216/3. Simona Mercuri has challenged Angelo Maria Bandini's, William Pettas's and my attribution of this grammar to Riccardini. See *La via al Principe: Niccolò Machiavelli da Firenze a San Casciano*. [Exhibition Catalogue]. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Firenze, 10 dicembre 2013–28 febbraio 2014, ed. Silvia Alessandri, Francesca de Luca, Francesco Martelli, and Francesca Tropea (Rimini: Imago, 2013), at 85–86. In a shortly forthcoming article, provisionally entitled, “Machiavelli and the grammarians”, *Archivio storico italiano*, 173 (2015), in press, I produce abundant new evidence demonstrating that the original attribution is secure.

- 64 The dedication on fol. a i verso: “Furius aliquo modo dictator Nicholao et Alexandro Machiavellis iunioribus S.P.D. Avita paternaue virtus, mi Nicholae et Alexander, cuius

Niccolò and Alessandro Machiavelli in the relevant period,⁶⁵ nor, given the completeness of the Florentine baptismal records (as confirmed by other genealogical sources), a possibility of fugitive brothers with the right names who have escaped notice.⁶⁶ However, there are two Machiavelli cousins of the right names, age and period: Alessandro di Niccolò di Alessandro di Filippo di Lorenzo di Filippo Machiavelli (b. 23 November 1470) and Niccolò di Messer Bernardo di Niccolò di Buoninsegna di Filippo Machiavelli (b. 3 May 1469).⁶⁷

imaginem vestro in vultu tanquam in speculo contemplor, me hortatur qui erudiendi vestri munus sucepturus sum, ut grammatices erudimenta, ea brevitate et ordine quo alios instituere soleo, eorum ut lectione frui possitis, in vulgare non differam. Curavi igitur et parvis commodiorem ad usum formis ut excuderentur, quae vobis hac epistola nuncupatim dicavi, ut pignus sit meae erga vos benivolentiae sempiternum, vosque hortor et doctoris autoritate qua polleo, volo, ac iubeo ut haec erudimenta continuo in manibus habeatis, haec legendo conteratis, hoc sit enchiridion vestrum. Erit enim tam conducibile quam quid maxime. Sucipite igitur hoc alacri fronte munusculum, et litteras, verum civium ornamentum, ampleramini, ut avi patrumque, ut virtutes et indolem, id etiam referatis. Valet et me diligite." This dedication is not mentioned by Giulio Negri, *Istoria degli scrittori fiorentini* (Ferrara: Bernardino Pomatelli, 1722), at 92, despite Pettas, *The Giunti of Florence*, 41.

65 According to the database of the Florentine Baptismal registers, now preserved at Florence, in the Archivio dell'Opera del Duomo, for the period 1450 to 1500, as compiled by Karl Schlebusch, there were three individuals named Alessandro Machiavelli born in these years:

1. Alessandro Chimenti e Romolo di Niccolò di Alessandro Machiavelli, popolo S. Felicità, born 23.11.1470, baptized the next day.
2. Alessandro e Romolo di Lorenzo di Niccolò Machiavelli, pop. S. Felicità, born June 20, bapt. June 21, 1502.
3. Alessandro Michelagnolo e Romolo di Niccolò di messer Bernardo Machiavelli, popolo S. Felicità, born and baptized 29.9.1505.

There were three named Niccolò (including the famous one):

1. Niccolò Piero e Michele di messer Bernardo Machiavelli, popolo S. Trinita, born 3.5.1469, baptized the next day;
2. Niccolò Giovanbattista e Romolo di Alessandro di Niccolò Machiavelli, popolo S. Felicità, born and baptized 9.1.1499;
3. Niccolò Vincentio e Romolo di Giovanni di Gerardo Machiavelli, popolo S. Felicità, born and baptized 12.11.1499.

I am grateful to Karl Schlebusch for help with this database.

66 The most complete genealogy of the Machiavelli family, compiled by Pompeo Litta, in his *Celebri famiglie italiane* (Milan: Giusti, 1819–1883), fasc. 64 ("Machiavelli di Firenze"), confirms that there were no brothers Niccolò and Alessandro Machiavelli in this period.

67 See n. 21 above. Niccolò di Alessandro di Niccolò (b. 9.1.1499), Niccolò di Giovanni di Gherardo (b. 12.11.1499), Alessandro di Lorenzo di Niccolò (n. 21.6.1502), or Alessandro

Absolute corroboration is provided by Riccardini's dedicatory letter, in which the two boys' "fathers" are mentioned.⁶⁸

The approximate date of the dedication is clear from the course of Niccolò Machiavelli's early education. Niccolò's first recorded Latin instructor was Matteo da Rocca San Casciano, with whom he began his lessons on 6 May 1476. Niccolò's second teacher was Battista di Filippo da Poppi, with whom he began to learn on 5 March 1477.⁶⁹ The information regarding Niccolò's instruction by these two pedagogues comes from his father Bernardo's famous *Ricordi*,⁷⁰ a text revealing another of Machiavelli's Latin teachers: Paolo Sassi da Ronciglione, with whom Niccolò and his younger brother Totto began their lessons on 5 November 1481.⁷¹ Before that date, Niccolò had gone to learn the abacus (commercial arithmetic) with Pier Maria Calandri, beginning on 3 January 1480.⁷² Bernardo Machiavelli's *Ricordi*, however, do not give a complete record of Niccolò's school education, with a nearly three-year gap from March 1477 until January 1480; moreover, the Latin curriculum Niccolò followed, as recorded in his father's diary, has a notable omission: he learned the final stages of the Latin parts of speech from Matteo and Battista; he is then noted as learning Latin composition at Paolo's school. There is no record of Niccolò's learning basic Latin syntax – an essential part of the medieval and Renaissance Latin school curriculum.⁷³ The missing teacher in the years 1478 and 1479 would seem to have been Benedetto Riccardini: indeed, the subject matter of the grammar he dedicated to the Machiavelli cousins – beginning Latin syntax – was precisely what Niccolò needed to have learned between his lessons on Latin morphology with Matteo and Battista and his work on Latin prose composition with Paolo. Riccardini's dedicatory letter makes it clear that he was, by the years 1478 to 1480, an experienced teacher, well used to presenting the rudiments of Latin syntax in digestible form to a wide range of pupils:

di Niccolò messer Bernardo (b. 29.9.1505) could not be the relevant cousins, because Alessandro di Lorenzo di Niccolò would have been seven years old at the time of the publication of the grammar (7 May 1510), too young to have been beginning a secondary grammar course (see below and Black, *Education*, 447, 462–3).

68 Riccardini 1510: fol. a i verso: "ut avi patrumque, ut virtutes et indolem, id etiam referatis".

69 Black, "New light," 391–2.

70 Bernardo Machiavelli, *Libro di ricordi*, ed. Cesare Olschki (Florence: Le Monnier, 1954). For corrections to this edition, see Black, "New light."

71 Black, "New light," 392.

72 Ibid.

73 On the Latin school curriculum, see Robert Black, *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy. Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

ea brevitate et ordine quo alios instituere soleo. So Riccardini seems to have had an established position as a grammar teacher – evidently in Florence – by the last quarter of the fifteenth century.

Shortly before beginning at S. Lorenzo, Riccardini became the first editor for the Florentine publisher Filippo Giunti, who was just setting up his press in Florence.⁷⁴ On 23 September 1497 Giunti published his first book, the *Epitome* of Zenobius (2nd c. AD), a collection of Greek proverbs in alphabetic order. The work was dedicated by its editor Riccardini to Giorgio Dati, a Florentine canon and vicar to the bishop of Arezzo; the Dati were a non-elite Florentine family who had, nevertheless, achieved prominence in the church hierarchy. Riccardini refers to Giorgio's young "nepotes," Leonardo and Niccolò, and their learned accomplishments, mentioning also the family's "great affection for him and patronage" (*amor in me maximus, et patrocinium quo semper usi estis in res nostras*); it sounds as if Riccardini may have worked as private tutor to these young men.⁷⁵

Riccardini's work for Giunti seems to have lapsed for several years but resumed again in 1503, when his edition of Catullus, Propertius and Tibullus appeared on 5 August, with a dedication to Buonaccorso Pepi, another well educated young man (*iuveni litterato*), this time from an elite Florentine family, who may also have been a former pupil of Riccardini's; included too were lives of these three poets written by a fellow associate of Poliziano's, Pietro Crinito, whose work Riccardini promised soon to publish.⁷⁶ There followed in rapid succession the same year editions of Horace, on 3 October, and of Valerius Flaccus, on 20 November; Riccardini's dedication to Filippo Nerli, another young Florentine aristocrat from a former magnate family, of the 1503 edition of Horace (when Nerli was 18 years old) is written in a magisterial tone and filled with magisterial advice, suggesting that Nerli was his pupil at that point; his pedagogic concerns extended to an analysis of Horace's metre types, based on the late fourth-century Roman grammarian Diomedes.⁷⁷

74 Pettas, *The Giunti of Florence*, 33–34.

75 Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 1–2; Pettas, *The Giunti of Florence*, 41–42.

76 Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 5–6; Pettas, *The Giunti of Florence*, 42.

77 Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 6–7: "Benedictus Philologus Florentinus, docto iuveni Philippo Nerlio S. Meus in te amor, humanitas, praeclarum ingenium tuum, quo mirifice adficior, impulerunt, Philippe, ut tibi politioris litteraturae, has Horatii lucubrationes, omnium genere doctrinarum refertas, et per nos modo recognitas, nominatim dicarem . . . Itaque hunc, atque alios doctrinarum adsertores, non tantum hortor ut legas et imiteris; sed rogo et obtestor, ut et tu gloria, et nos tui amantissimi doctrina tua, frui possimus". See also Alberto Nicolai, *Filippo de' Nerli, 1485–1556* (Pisa: Nistri, 1906), at 13. In this preface Riccardini again refers to his close association with Pietro Crinito: "ipsum [sc. Horatium]

Horatian metres were an established part of the Italian Renaissance grammar educational syllabus;⁷⁸ Riccardini would have used the same didactic materials and methods when teaching his advanced pupils at S. Lorenzo. The edition of Valerius Flaccus was dedicated to Riccardini's old friend, Bernardo Michelozzi, referring to the latter's famous journey to Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean during 1497 and 1498 in search of manuscripts, which were then brought back to Florence.⁷⁹ Riccardini also refers here to Bartolomeo Fonzio's efforts in restoring the text of Valerius Flaccus, for whom the latter had a lifelong passion and on whom he lectured several times at the University of Florence.⁸⁰ The marginally critical allusions to Fonzio's youthful enthusiasms for this text and for his more mature interventions make one wonder whether Riccardini might not have been a fellow student (and rival) of Fonzio's, whose later lectures he eventually exploited in his own edition of Valerius.

Early the next year on 27 January, Riccardini came out with an edition of Sallust, dedicated to Antonio di Matteo di Giovanni Canigiani, a young knight hospitaller and pupil of Antonio Francini da Montevarchi (mentioned in the dedication), a future editor for Giunti himself and later also an important teacher in Florence;⁸¹ in this preface, Riccardini also mentioned another of

et Petrus Crinitus nostri studiosus, honesto suffragio comprobatur" (Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 6–7).

78 See Black, *Humanism and Education*, 319.

79 Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 8: "Sextum abhinc annum, nobilissimas Europae, atque Asaiae urbes, omnisque nostri maris insulas, peninsulasque studio indefesso penetra-sti, ut Atticam eloquentiam, et omnes pene Graecorum libros, in quibus eruditio ampla, et recondita contineretur, a barbarica compede revocares, revocatique Florentiam ad tuam et studiosorum utilitatem deportarentur." See Borsook, "The Travels of Bernardo Michelozzi."

80 Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 8: "Qui liber (scilicet Valerius Flaccus) antea maioribus et pluribus, non dico mendis, sed portentis, ac monstris scatebat, quibus tollendis unus Hercules satis fuit Bartholomaeus Fontius, varia linguarum litteratura munitus, atque instructus, cui ingens gratia habenda est, quum in adolescentia in eo corrigendo plurimum laboraverit; modo enim saniori per aetatem consilio, doctissima interpretatione hunc candidissimum poetam, ab iniuria audacis inscitiae vindicavit, salebrosa levigans, obscura illustrans, maculosa emaculans; quam elegantem, et eruditam interpretationem, una cum aliis eius lucubratissimis operibus publicare iam accincti sumus." See Alessandro Daneloni, ed. *Bartolomeo Fonzio. Letters to Friends*, tr. Martin Davies (Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 2011), viii–ix.

81 Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 3–5. See BNCF, Carte Passerini, 186 n. 77, tavola 9: "F. Antonio [di Matteo di Giovanni Canigiani], cavaliere di Malta 1504, ricevitore del priorato di Pisa 1511, commendatario di S. Frosino alla Volpaia e S. Severo a Ligri 1512, Balio di S. Iacopo in campo Corbolini 1512, commendatore della casa di S. Salvatore in diocesi di Fiesole

Canigiani's teachers, Iacopo di Bartolomeo da Garfagnana, grammar master in the Studio Fiorentino, 1492–96,⁸² as well as another future editor for Giunti, Niccolò Angeli da Bucine, a grammar teacher and lecturer in rhetoric at the Studio Fiorentino, 1495–98, 1500–04,⁸³ whose close affiliation with Antonio Canigiani Riccardini, so he himself declared, wished to emulate.⁸⁴ Later that year on 16 September Riccardini published a collection of eclogues by three Roman poets, Vergil, Calpurnius (1st c. AD) and Nemesianus (3rd c. AD), by Petrarch and Boccaccio, and by two contemporary humanists, Battista Mantovano (1448–1516) and Pomponio Gaurico (1481/82–1528); these were dedicated to another young Florentine student of the humanities, Giovambattista Nasi, from a prominent if not ancient Florentine family.⁸⁵ In the dedication Riccardini again names Crinito, whose work *De honesta disciplina* he mentions as about to be published by Giunti; he also makes it clear that the collection of eclogues was jointly prepared by him and Crinito.⁸⁶

Riccardini's next edition for Giunti was indeed Crinito's *De honesta disciplina*, published on 1 December 1504 and dedicated to the Pistoiese humanist, Scipione Forteguerra (1466–1515), who had studied first in Rome, then probably in Florence under Poliziano, and finally during the 1490s in Padua, where he

1514, + 11 maggio 1548." He was born after 1478, when his father Matteo married Francesca Giugni: *ibid.*; Franco Bacchelli, s.v. "Francini Antonio" in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* L (1998), at 142, erroneously identifies this Antonio Canigiani as "Antonio Canigiani, il futuro genero di Tommaso Soderini, nipote del gonfaloniere Piero," overlooking the dedication of the work to a celibate hospitaller: (fol. a iii recto) "Benedictus Philologus Florentinus Antonio Canisiano militi hierosolymitano suo"; moreover, no Antonio Canigiani was married to a great nephew of Piero Soderini, according to the full genealogy published by Litta, *Celebri famiglie*, disp. 144, "Soderini di Firenze."

82 Verde, *Lo studio fiorentino*, I, 348–59.

83 *Ibid.*, I, 358–83 *passim*.

84 Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 4–5; Paola Tentori s.v. "Angeli Niccolò," in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* III (1961), 199–200.

85 Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 11–12: "quidquid tibi vel studiorum sedulitas, vel amicorum negotia tribuent otii, id omne ad eas lectitandas, tecumque recolendas potissimum conferes; quod ipsum te facturum et noster Crinitus monere me non destitit [...] cuius eruditae lucubrationes de honesta disciplina, in officina nostra propemodum escusae, in communem studiosorum utilitatem feliciter prodibunt [...] Vale speciem bonarum disciplinarum et has etiam praeludentes eclogas cum silva lepidissima, post excusum opus, et ad coronidem perductum, ab utriusque nostrum coniunctissimo dono missas, inter alias adnumerare velim."

86 Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 2: "has etiam praeludentes eclogas cum silva lepidissima, post excusum opus, et ad coronidem perductam, ab utriusque nostrum [sc. Riccardini and Crinito] coniunctissimo dono missas, inter alias adnumerare velim."

followed the philosophy lectures of Pomponazzi, Vernia and Nifo; Forteguerra came into contact with Aldo Manuzio in Venice, becoming a key member of his New Academy at the beginning of the sixteenth century, working with him on various printing projects, including an edition of Demosthenes and emerging as a Greek specialist, giving classes in Greek language.⁸⁷ Curiously, Riccardini's dedication letter to Forteguerra contains criticism: his "efforts" are "filled with elegance and great erudition" (*labores tuos, et elegantia, et multiplici rerum cognitione refertos*), but they are not polished (*non spendescunt lima*), "they are not executed without injury to the Latin language" (*non sine Romanae linguae iniuria atteruntur*); Riccardini wants Forteguerra to send him his writings so that he can "see them, read them thoroughly, have them typeset": we want to "take the same pleasure from your efforts that you will have enjoyed from ours" (*Patere igitur philologum tuum eos videre, perlegere, formis excudere [...] eadem percipere ex lucubrationibus tuis voluptatem, qua tu perferis ex nobis*). All this suggests that, in fact, Forteguerra had been Riccardini's pupil when the latter attended Poliziano's lectures in the later 1480s: by sending Forteguerra Crinito's *De honesta disciplina* – an educational compendium of Latinity – Riccardini seems to have been suggesting that Forteguerra's Latin culture could come to match his skill and erudition in Greek: "I have witnessed with how much labour, how much diligence he [sc. Crinito] sweated over proper writing hitherto, so that no one could in an entire life achieve a purer command of antiquity than by studying this work for a time" (*Testis ego sum, quantis ille laboribus, quanta diligentia in bonis litteris hactenus desudarit, ut qui nihil potius, aut antiquius tota vita habuerit, quam id aliquando consequi*).⁸⁸

Riccardini's next project was particularly apt for a grammar teacher: an edition of Terence, who had been a favoured author in Italian Latin schools during the fifteenth century.⁸⁹ It was a philological project particularly apt for Riccardini, whose own teacher, Poliziano, had laboured to restore the metres to Terence, earlier presented as a prose author. The book was suitably dedicated to Crinito on 8 August 1505. Inserted before Riccardini's preface were Latin verses, celebrating Poliziano's achievement in restoring Terence to his ancient purity from its barbaric state as well as the love that Riccardini devoted to the text: *Docta vulneribus manu levatis, | Antiquum reparatus in decorem, | Summa Politiani ope, arte, cura, | Phebaeo Benedicti amore pleni*. In the preface Riccardini recalls how much work he devoted to restoring the metres of

87 Francesco Piovan, s.v. "Forteguerra (Carteromaco), Scipione," in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* XLIX (1997), 163–167.

88 Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 13–14.

89 Black, *Humanism and Education*, 254–56.

Terence: *Quantum laboris atque diligentiae posuerim in recognoscendis, et in metra legitima restituendis Terentii fabulis*. He celebrates Poliziano's enormous achievement in restoring Terence's meter and in exploiting old textual witnesses, and he hopes that he himself will have followed this lead: *Ego autem spero me consequutum hac nostra diligentia*. His edition was above all a teaching tool: he supplemented the texts with writings by ancient grammarians such as Hephaestion (2nd c. AD), Terentianus Maurus (late 2nd. c. AD), Donatus, Rufinus (5th c. AD), Diomedes and Priscian on metrics and comedy. Riccardini also declares that the arguments or summaries of the comedies, traditionally attributed to Terence himself, were actually the work of Sulpicius Appollinaris (2nd c. AD), "which I discovered, on the basis of old manuscripts which I found in Venice and elsewhere" (*quod ipsum effeci, adductus vetustate codicum, qui cum alibi, tum Venetiis habentur*). Given the book's dedication, Crinito's life of Terence from his *De poetis latinis* was aptly prefaced to the text.⁹⁰

Riccardini's final publication with Giunti during his lifetime was an edition of Seneca's tragedies, dedicated on 3 April 1506 to Domenico Benivieni. This work was particularly associated with S. Lorenzo, where Benivieni was a canon. Benivieni was a militant Savonarolan, even suspended from the chapter in the period of Savonarola's fall,⁹¹ but there is no evidence that Riccardini shared his sympathies. It is clear from the preface to the Seneca edition that, even in 1506, eight years since Savonarola's execution, Benivieni was still attempting to turn Riccardini away from secular literature in favour of Christian and theological reading: "although you have introduced the field of sacred literature to us, accustomed for so long to humanist studies, contrary to your own inclination" (*nos, contra animi tui sententiam et diu in humanioribus his studiis versatos, tua illa propensa in omnes bonitate, et singulari doctrina, ad sacrarum litterarum cognitionem induxeris*). Riccardini particularly admired a now lost work of Benivieni's, *Lucerna religiosorum*, "which I embrace and admire, to such an extent that I do not cease to commend it, so eagerly seen and read by me" (*Tuum praeterea illud opus [...] quod Lucerna religiosorum inscribitur, ita amplector, et admiror, ut commendare non desinam; quod adeo cupide vidimus et legimus*); another work of Benivieni's, *Comentarii in sacros ecclesiae omnes hymnos*, was still in his hands, "which, even if I know I am not qualified to ascend to that point, that is to judge your competence, [nevertheless] I know it emanates not from you but from nature, from God." (*sunt adhuc in manibus in sacros omnes ecclesiae hymnos commentaria, quae [etsi scio me non esse in*

90 Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 17–19.

91 Lorenzo Polizzotto, *The Elect Nation. The Savonarolan Movement in Florence, 1494–1545* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 116.

hoc albo, nec eum, qui huc ascendam, id est ad iudicium rerum tuarum] non sunt tua, naturae sunt, Dei sunt). Also prefaced to the text is a treatise by Riccardini on tragedy and on the parts of tragedy, as well as Crinito's life of Seneca from his *De poetis latinis*. The contrast drawn by Riccardini between his own secular humanist predilections (as still evidenced by the contents of this final edition for Giunti) and Benivieni's philosophical, religious and philosophical interests –

Nam dialecticam et philosophiam sic tenes, ut ea defendas acriter quaestiones propositas, et impugnes vehementer. De priscis ecclesiae doctoribus, deque neotericis theologis tantum iudicium apud te residet, ut si quis extempore abstrusam illorum cuiuspiam quaestionem enucleandam petat, eam tanti ingenii tui felicitate enodem reddis, ut magnum sit, quod ille de te sibi polliceatur⁹²

– confirms that philosophical, religious and theological studies were not on the syllabus at the school of S. Lorenzo.

Riccardini was not a priest when elected *maestro de' chierici* at S. Lorenzo, and so it was not immediately possible to allocate him a stipendiary chapel in S. Lorenzo; however, it was duly noted that he would be assigned the “salary of the chapel when he will become a priest” (*col salario della cappella quando farà prete*).⁹³ Riccardini seems to have been duly ordained by the following 7 August, when he was assigned one of the chaplains' rooms for his living accommodation at S. Lorenzo.⁹⁴ On 26 May 1505 Riccardini was elected *camarlingo* for the clerks at S. Lorenzo, in charge of the financial administration of the school.⁹⁵ In 1506 a dispute arose between Riccardini and one Carlo di Silvestro detto Riccio with regard to the stipendiary choral chapel of S. Bartolomeo, assigned to Riccardini as to other *maestri de' chierici* of S. Lorenzo during their tenure as teachers. Riccardini successfully took this case to the papal curia in Rome at his own expense, and in recompense on 17 March 1506 he was promised the

92 For this edition of Seneca and its preface, see Bandini, *De Florentina*, II, 19–21.

93 ASL 2366, fol. 63v (27 February 1498).

94 ASL 2366, fol. 68r: “essendo vacata la tertia camera de' cappellani [...] fu consignata a ser Benedetto di Piero Riccardini [the last two words written in a 17th-c. hand] al presente maestro de' predetti novitii”. Another chaplain's room was assigned to him on 12 January 1499, “tenuta pratica da sortire el nostro maestro de' novitii in una camera a llui et alla sua professione comoda” (ASL 2366, fol. 73r). Yet another room was assigned to him on 5 September 1499 (ASL 2366, fol. 79r).

95 ASL 2181, fols. 40v, 51v; ASL 2461, fols. 80r–87r.

first chapel to become vacant in S. Lorenzo.⁹⁶ Two months later, ser Francesco d'Antonio Dini, a chaplain in the Florentine cathedral, obtained a privilege from the pope, securing the right to the next available canonry in S. Lorenzo; the Chapter, regarding such an action as a violation of their ancient prerogatives, resolved to elect Riccardini instead to the first vacant canonry, annulling the previous grant to him of a further chaplaincy.⁹⁷ Again the dispute was taken to Rome and, on 4 June 1506, a favourable bull from Pope Julius II was received at S. Lorenzo: Riccardini then duly became a canon of S. Lorenzo.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, he continued in his teaching post as *maestro de' chierici* until 8 March 1507, when the chapter was notified that "messer Benedetto the master of our novitiates was gravely ill and could only with difficulty attend to his duties in the school" (*avendo notitia messer Benedecto nostro maestro de' nostri novitii era gravemente infirmato et difficilmente poteva attendere alla cura della nostra schuola*).⁹⁹ The next day Riccardini was removed from his post as

96 Florence, Biblioteca Moreniana MS 33 (Pier Nolasco Cianfogno, *Notizie di uomini illustri dell'illustri Collegiata di S. Lorenzo di Firenze*), fol. 104r; ASL 2181, fol. 49r (17 March 1506).

97 ASL 2181, fol. 50r (9 May 1506); Biblioteca Moreniana MS 33, fol. 104r.

98 ASL 2181, fol. 50v (4 June 1506).

99 ASL 2181, fol. 54v. See ASF, Notarile antecosmiano 250 (ser Donato Ciampelli, a. 1505–7) fol. 208v: "Pro capitulo Sancti Laurentii Florentie. Die sexta martii 1506. Cum sit quod dominus Benedictus Petri de Riccardinis magister clericorum secularis et collegiate ecclesie Sancti Laurentii Florentie sit infirmus et non valeat deservire scolasticis et clericis dicte ecclesie nec eos docere ut opus est, propterea capitulariter congregati ad sonum campanelle et alias servatis de iure servandis et de mandato infrascripti domini prioris etc. omnes infrascripti prior et canonici dicte ecclesie in domo domini Caroli de Neronibus, qui est infirmus, quorum nomina sunt ista videlicet: dominus Castorius de Bosolinis prior, dominus Iulianus de Tendis, dominus Franciscus Campana, dominus Matheus de Bigazis, dominus Carolus de Neronibus, dominus Laurentius Francisci, dominus Paulus de Comparinis, dominus Hyeronimus de Bozolinis, omnes canonici et vocem habentes in dicto capitulo asserentes et non revocandorum etc. fecerunt eorum et dicti capituli syndacos et procuratores dictos dominum Castorium priorem, dominum Franciscum Campana[m], magistrum Dominicum de Benivienis et duos ex eis in concordia presentes dominum priorem et dominum Franciscum etc. et absentem dictum magistrum Dominicum tamquam presentem specialiter et expresse ad removendum cassandum etc. dictum magistrum clericorum et alium suo loco eligendum et ordinandum et iterum dictum sic ordinatum cassandum et alium etc. totiens quotiens opus fuerit, et circa dictum magistrum et cappellaniam que pro dicto magistro a domino nostro papa ordinata est et solita ad nutum dari dicto magistro, quamumque ordinationem facere et ordinare etc. et ad omnes actus circa ea necessaria facienda, dantes mihi licentiam dictos actus hic extendendi [...] Actum in domo seu camera dicti domini Caroli de Neronibus in canonicam [sic] dicte ecclesie presentibus [...] cappellanis dicte ecclesie testibus."

maestro de' chierici and a substitute, ser Iacopo di Franceschetto Corso, was chosen.¹⁰⁰ Riccardini made his will on 11 March, leaving his books to the convent of S. Marco, except for a copy of Pliny, which belonged to S. Lorenzo and which he duly instructed to be returned; his heirs were his niece Brigida, daughter of an innkeeper called Pippo (possibly Riccardini's brother-in-law) and a woman called Bartolomea, daughter of a servite friar from S. Annunziata (it is possible or even likely that Bartolomea was Riccardini's mistress).¹⁰¹ These instructions were not followed scrupulously by his heirs, who sold one of his books, a copy of Marcantonio Sabellico's *Enneades*, to Riccardini's pupil, Lorenzo Romuleo,¹⁰² on 27 May 1507.¹⁰³ On the following 16 March Riccardini

100 ASL 2181, fol. 54v. See ASF, Notarile antecosimiano 5250 (ser Donato Ciampelli, a. 1505–7), fol. 208v, as transcribed in preceding note.

101 ASF, Notarile antecosimiano 5251, inserto 1506–14, n. 6: 11 March 1507. “Testamentum domini Benedicti de Riccardinis canonici Sancti Laurentii. Die XI mensis Martii 1506. Cum nihil [rest of paragraph missing]. Dominus Benedictus Petri de Riccardinis canonicus ecclesie Sancti Laurentii Florentie sanus etc. In primis animam suam etc. Item iure legati etc. Opere [Sancti Marie Florum] L. 3. Item iure legati reliquit etc. priori et conventui Sancti Marci de Florentia omnes suos libros de quibus constat per inventarium existens penes dictos fratres, excepto Plinio [crossed out: Platina, libro], qui est capituli Sancti Laurentii, cum cassia [= capsula] q(uod) [sic pro que] decet Fl. 50 auri largis et plus et minus secundum conscientiam infrascriptorum executorum. Item iure legati reliquit et legavit Brigide eius nepti et filie Pippi hospitis Fl. 5, quos habere debet ab Antonio Lodovici de Masis, videlicet iure scripte private, creditum artis cambii, decembr[is] officitura. In omnibus autem aliis suis bonis suos heredes instituit etc. dominam Brigidam et Bartolomeam filiam fratris Augustini de Sancta Sun[t]iata equis portionibus, quibus substituit matres respectivas si sine filiis etc. Executores autem etc. fecit dominum Iulianum Bartolomei et dominum Matheum de Burgo etc. cum amplo mandato et cum pote[re] substitutionis. [Testibus:] magistro Dominico de Benivenis / ser Lapo Dominici rectore sancti Michaelis a Castello / ser Dominico Bartolomei Iohannis / ser Luca Stephani / ser Philippo Mariotti Nanis / ser Iacobo Francisci Sandri / ser Piero Bartolomei rectore.”

102 In the preface to Romuleo's edition of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Hermogenes, published by Giunti in 1509, Romuleo says he taught rhetoric for fifteen years in the convent of Vallombrosa, and refers thus to Riccardini: “Et licet nos, et omnis posteritas Aldo Manutio primum, mox Benedicto Philologo, praeceptoris meo, cuius manibus studiosi debent, ac demum ceteris, qui huiusmodi provinciam expoliendae latinitatis susceperunt debere plurimum fateamur” (Bandini, *De Florentina*, I, 130 and II, 25; see also Pettas, *The Giunti of Florence*, 239–40).

103 BNCF, Magl. 1.1.1: Sabellicus, Marcus Antonius. *Enneades* ab orbe condito. Venezia: Bernardino e Matteo Vitali per Democrito da Terracina e Demetrio Coletti, 31 III 1498. The erased ownership note reads: die 27 madii M.D.VII (...) bibliotheca B. philologi praeceptoris hu(i)us, emptus ab heredibus – Y [= librae] – 9. “Et AmiCorum” is written

died (*messer Benedetto di Piero Riccardini [...] morì a dì 16 di marzo 1506 [ab inc.]*),¹⁰⁴ and the next day a permanent replacement was found in the person of ser Giovanni Battista di maestro Matteo “detto Manco”.¹⁰⁵ Finally the following 19 November the chapter noted that Riccardini had spent 9 *florini larghi* at the Roman curia in legal action to retain the privileges of S. Lorenzo (regarding his chaplaincy and canonry), and so his heirs were duly to be reimbursed for the sum of 6 florins.¹⁰⁶

A short neo-classical poem by Machiavelli was *Dell'occasione*, consisting of twenty-two lines of tercets.¹⁰⁷ The text is a loose adaptation of an epigram (xxxiii [xii]) by the late Latin poet Ausonius¹⁰⁸ (itself derived from the Hellenistic Greek poet Posidippus).¹⁰⁹ In the first Florentine edition by the publisher Giunti (1549), the poem was described as a *capitolo*, but the only feature it shares with his three *capitoli* (*Di fortuna, Dell'ingratitude, Dell'ambizione*)¹¹⁰ is its *terza rima* verse form. Tercets were the preferred equivalent of the widely

by another hand over the erased middle of Lorenzo Romuleo's ownership note. In front of the erased ownership note is written “Laurentii Romulei,” slightly askew from the erased note; this ownership signature was never erased. It looks as if the “amici” of Romulei added their part of the ownership note, possibly after they came into possession of the book. The hand that wrote the date “Die 27 madii MDVII” is Romuleo's, as is the note of ownership. According to the typescript catalogue in the Sala de' Manoscritti of BNCF (Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze, Catalogo Incunaboli, a cura di Piero Scapecci, con la collaborazione di M. Nesca, M.G. Pepe, F. Tropea, aggiornamento novembre 2011 [SALA MSS CAT 76/A], 393, BNCF 2449): “Annotazione ms: ‘Laurentii Romulei’ sopra una scritta abrasa datata 27 v 1507 forse di Benedetto Ricardini (?) ‘Philologi praeceptoris emptus de Medicis’ (?)”, but this is inaccurate: see above. The glosses are almost entirely by Romuleo.

104 ASL 2461, fol. 90r.

105 ASL 2181, fol. 55r. See ASF, Notarile antecosimiano 5250 (ser Donato Ciampelli, a. 1505–7): “Die XVI mensis martii 1506. Electio magistri in ecclesia Sancti Laurentii. Reverendi patris domini Castorius de Bozolinis prior et Franciscus Campana canonicus secularis et collegiate ecclesie Sancti Laurentii Florentie sindici et procurators capituli capituli [sic] dicte ecclesie prout de eorum mandato constat manu mei notarii infrascripti omni meliori modo etc. cassaverunt etc. ser [spatium] Franceschetti quem elegerunt in magistrum dicte ecclesie [...] et loco eius ordinaverunt magistrum ser Iohannem Baptistam magistri Mathei de Marchis [...] cum oneribus et honoribus et emolumentis etc. rogantes etc. Actum in domo dicti domini prioris [...]”.

106 ASL 2181, fol. 60r.

107 Niccolò Machiavelli, *I capitoli*, ed. Giorgio Inglese (Rome: Bulzoni, 1981), 157.

108 Ibid., 106.

109 Bausi, *Machiavelli*, 157.

110 Machiavelli, *Capitoli*, 113–53.

used classical metrical form, the elegaic distich or stanza,¹¹¹ a particular favourite of Ovid's, and employed by Ausonius in this epigram. Machiavelli's translation was dedicated to Filippo de' Nerli, and it conceivably constituted an allusive tribute to the grammar teacher whom the two friends, Machiavelli and Nerli, had had in common: Benedetto Riccardini.¹¹² Riccardini's own teacher, Poliziano, had compared Ausonius's epigram with its Greek original on two separate occasions (in the first book of his *Miscellanea* and in his commentary on Statius), and it is possible that Machiavelli was here recalling lessons from Riccardini that the latter had in turn derived from Poliziano.¹¹³ So the whole process would have become, in Machiavelli's hands, an elaborate literary conceit, involving multiple stages of imitation and translation as well as of interlocking pupil-teacher relationships.

It is curious how much of Machiavelli's early education was entrusted to ecclesiastical teachers. Battista da Poppi was a chaplain at the Florentine Baptistry. Benedetto Riccardini would become the most distinguished of S. Lorenzo's teachers in the fifteenth century. Paolo Sassi was a teacher at both S. Lorenzo and at the Florentine Cathedral. Of his reading and grammar masters, only Matteo da Rocca San Casciano, his first recorded teacher, remained without affiliations to church schools or institutions in his twenty-year career in Florence (1460–1480);¹¹⁴ his abacus teacher, Piero Maria Calandri, like virtually all abacists, was a layman also without ecclesiastical connections. And yet Machiavelli became one of the most notorious religious sceptics of his age. Machiavelli's friends¹¹⁵ (and enemies)¹¹⁶ teased him for his supposed lack of devotion, and he himself said he did not listen to sermons;¹¹⁷ his wills left nothing for pious concerns, masses or posthumous prayers,¹¹⁸ and his reputation

111 Ibid., 106. See Dionisotti, *Machiavellerie*, 68.

112 For Nerli as a pupil of Riccardini's, see Niccolai, *Filippo de' Nerli*, 13; Bandini, *De Florentina*, II. 6–7 and above 122.

113 For Nerli, Riccardini, and Poliziano, see Mario Martelli, "Paralipomeni alla 'Giarda': enti tesi sul *Dialogo della lingua*," *Filologia e critica* 4 (1979): 212–279, at 253; Machiavelli, *Capitoli*, 109.

114 Black, *Education*, 350, 361, 393–94, 411–12, 415–22, 541, 674–75.

115 Machiavelli, *Lettere*, 422.

116 Ibid., 315–16.

117 Ibid., 431.

118 *Opere di Niccolò Machiavelli cittadino e segretario fiorentino* (Italia [Florence] 1813), cxxiii–cxliv. He left the minimal statutory contributions to the *opera* and the sacristy of the cathedral and to the Florentine walls: *ibid.*, cxxiv, cxxxix.

for impiety led to false rumors that he did not baptize his own children.¹¹⁹ In his first will of 1511 he commended his soul to God, the Virgin, and the heavenly court; in the second of 1522, he made just a token pious gesture, commending his soul to God alone.¹²⁰ No reader of Machiavelli's sarcastic discussion of ecclesiastical principalities in *The Prince* chapter XI, of the *Discourses* with their portrait of Christianity and the Roman church as the enemy of *virtù* (I.xii; II.ii), of his mocking indictment of Christian teachings and practices in the *Ass* (v.106–111), of his black comedic portrait of the corrupt and mercenary confessor Fra Timoteo in *Mandragola*, could be left in doubt that he was violently anti-clerical and anti-Christian. The portrait of God's impotence or at best indifference in the *Ass* (v.115–117, 124–127) makes one wonder whether Machiavelli was not, in effect, an atheist – as reported by Paolo Giovio.¹²¹ A striking Machiavellian picture of religious devotion – or lack thereof – emerges in the spoof *Capitoli per una compagnia di piacere*,¹²² which parodies the statutes of Florence's many confraternities. Even the *Exortatione alla penitenza*¹²³ was composed, so it has been convincingly argued, as a commission for someone else, evidently to be delivered at a meeting of a Florentine confraternity: to make a credible plea for Christian piety, Machiavelli deliberately seized in this text on some of his own most blasphemous utterances, substituting David as a paragon of Christian penitence for the infamous portrait as the Old Testament counterpart of the ruthlessly unchristian Philip of Macedon (*Discourses* I.xxvi), while proposing a Christian contempt for the world that he had so memorably lambasted in the *Discourses* as the source of contemporary Italy's military and political weakness.¹²⁴ In fact, the education provided by Florence's ecclesiastical teachers was increasingly secular and hardly conducive to piety – as is illustrated by the school of S. Lorenzo in its first fifty years. Paolo Sassi's teaching – as revealed by Crinito's exercise book – was non-religious; his sec-

119 Machiavelli, *Lettere*, 99, a claim contradicted by his correspondence (*Lettere*, 172, 179, 266) and by the database of Florentine baptisms in the Florentine Archivio dell'Opera del Duomo.

120 *Opere di Niccolò Machiavelli cittadino*, cxxxiv, cxxxix.

121 Paolo Giovio, *Ritratti degli uomini illustri*, ed. Carlo Caruso (Palermo: Sellerio, 1999), 198.

122 Niccolò Machiavelli, *Opere*, ed. Corrado Vivanti, 3 vols (Turin: Einaudi, 1997–2005), III, 243–47.

123 *Ibid.*, III, 247–50.

124 Emanuele Cutinelli-Rèndina, "Riscrittura e mimesi: il caso dell'*Esortazione alla penitenza*," in *Cultura e scrittura di Machiavelli*, eds. Francesco Adorno and Giorgio Barberi Squarotti (Rome: Salerno, 1998), 413–21, also pointing out that the autograph text contains Italian translations of simple Latin phrases, which Machiavelli would not have needed for his own delivery (415 n. 7).

ular tastes are further highlighted as the dedicatee of Michele Verino's posthumous distichs. He was a paedophile, who might have molested Machiavelli and Francesco Vettori. Paolo Comparini was an effete dandy, censured for his suspect "secular" encounters with his pupils. Pietro Domizi was another hypocritical paedophile who composed devotional, moralizing and religious plays for pupils whom he sodomized. In contrast, Benedetto Riccardini was an upright figure vis-à-vis the boys under his charge (although he might have kept a mistress, whom he named as one of his heirs), but his considerable scholarly achievements were secular and he confessed his own religious shortcomings to his Savonarolan colleague at S. Lorenzo, Domenico Benivieni. Machiavelli's pedagogic experience with such teachers – several of whom were hypocritical ecclesiastics with a record of egregious paedophilia – could hardly have set him on a path to religious conformity and pious devotion.

Addendum: Paolo Sassi da Ronciglione's first known appearance on the Florentine educational scene was at the Servite convent of SS. Annunziata, where he taught grammar to the "frati di casa" from 18 July 1466 to 31 July 1467 at a monthly salary of 4 lire (ASF, Corporazioni Religiose soppresse dal Governo Francese, 119, 160, fols. 189r, 202v, 211r, 212v, 215v).

Renaissance Sources in Medieval Mirrors for Princes

Petrarch and Andreas Pannonius

Sándor Bene

The Echoes of a Lecture

The May afternoon was pleasant and quiet – and stayed that way. The great lecture hall in the main building of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences had filled with people, all gathered to listen to the guest of the session, Professor John Monfasani.¹ The title of his paper, *Renaissance Humanism and Language*, was far from sensationalist. Its conclusion did not, at first sight, seem provocative: “Ciceronianism ceased to be an issue only when Latin had ceased to be the main vehicle of literary and scientific discourse, that is to say, when the Middle Ages ended.” Still, when the lecture was over, a mounting tension was evident. Several listeners raised their hands, wanting to air their views, but were turned down. The chair of the session explained that, by tradition, the HAS individual lectures are not followed by discussion. A surprised silence fell upon the crowd, broken by murmurs of dissent. It is worth taking a close look at the possible causes of this reluctance to allow discussion.

The thesis of Monfasani’s lecture repeated and referred to the conclusion of his earlier study, an article entitled “The Renaissance as the Concluding Phase of the Middle Ages”: “In point of fact, the Renaissance was not the undoing of the Middle Ages, but its culmination; and Renaissance humanism represented not a rupture but a completion of a cultural enterprise that started with the Carolingian Renaissance.”² This innovative periodization generated intense intellectual excitement in Hungary for a number of historical reasons.

1 Monfasani gave the lecture at Section I of the HAS on May 19, 2008. It represented HAS’s contribution to the conference held to commemorate the 500th anniversary of Mátyás Hunyadi’s ascent to the throne (“Matthias Rex 1458–1490: Hungary at the Dawn of the Renaissance,” Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, May 20–25, 2008).

2 For the text of the lecture see: http://mta.hu/fileadmin/I_osztaly/eloadastar/Monfasani.pdf (accessed November 2, 2013); the study referred to is John Monfasani, “The Renaissance as

The Renaissance era itself, its features, its cultural efforts and effects have always been an ideological issue of primary importance in Hungarian scholarship. During the nineteenth century, the reign of Matthias Hunyadi (1458–90), the Renaissance king, lent political legitimacy to an ideology of national grandeur.³ Later, following World War I, when Hungary had to surrender more than two thirds of its prewar territories and lost a great number of its inhabitants, scholars of the Renaissance (whose work was otherwise of a high standard) gave a moral cast to the idea of Hungary's 'cultural supremacy' over the newborn nations that were its neighbors.⁴ In the inter-war period, Hungary experienced its own 'revolt of the medievalists' – that is to say, while Huizinga and others also attracted some followers, still the 'Latin Renaissance – national/vernacular Renaissance' narrative, which provided a link between Janus Pannonius (1434–1472) and Bálint Balassi (1554–1594), remained dominant.⁵ After World War II, this *Geistesgeschichte* narrative was replaced by one based on Marxist historical thought which, alongside the key ideas of Burckhardt and Dilthey (the cult of personality, intellectual autonomy, and anticlericalism),⁶ also adopted and made excellent use of Hans Baron's 'civic humanism' thesis. In the 1960s, this Marxist amalgam provided the framework for the ideological introductory chapters on the politically progressive, bourgeois, anticlerical,

the Concluding Phase of the Middle Ages," *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo* 108 (2006): 165–185.

- 3 See Ernő Marosi, "Risorgimento e Rinascimento in Ungheria," in *Italy and Hungary: Humanism and Art in the Early Renaissance*, ed. Péter Farbaky and Louis A. Waldman (Florence: Villa I Tatti-Officina Libraria, 2011), 5–42; and esp. 6–7.
- 4 Important figures were József Huszti (1887–1954), the author of the first modern monograph on Janus Pannonius (*Janus Pannonius*, Pécs, 1931) and his student, László Juhász (1905–1970), editor of the series *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum*. See Ágnes Ritoókné Szalay, "Juhász László és a Bibliotheca," in Id., *Kutak: Tanulmányok a xv–xvi. századi magyarországi művelődés köréből* (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2013), 350–359; Farkas Gábor Kiss, "Separation of Classical and Neo-Latin Philology: First Half of the 20th Century," in *A Companion to the History of the Neo-Latin Studies in Hungary*, ed. István Bartók (Budapest: Universitas, 2005), 68–73.
- 5 On Tibor Kardos, Jenő Koltay-Kastner and others, see Kiss, 75–79; on the 'revolt of the medievalists,' see Cesare Vasoli, "Il Rinascimento tra mito e realtà storica," in *Le filosofie del Rinascimento*, ed. Cesare Vasoli and Paolo Costantino Pissavino (Milano: Mondadori, 2002), 18–22; cf. Wallace K. Ferguson, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation* (Boston: The Riverside Press, 1948), 329–385.
- 6 On Dilthey: Vasoli, "Il Rinascimento," 12–14; on Burckhardt's concept of Modernity, featuring the "dominance of nation state, liberal individualism, secularism and the decline of religious belief": James Hankins, "Religion and the Modernity of Renaissance Humanism," in *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism*, ed. Angelo Mazzocco (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 139.

and antifeudal Renaissance in the new *History of Hungarian Literature*,⁷ which was published with substantial state funding, and was written and edited under strict ideological control.

Ironically, by the time both the Communist regime and the reference book became obsolete, the earlier ideology of unification had started to attract new followers: in the simplified world of liberal political fantasy, defending the autonomy and modernity of the Renaissance era by cutting it off the Middle Ages became one of the criteria for being politically correct. Professor Monfasani's ideas about periodization, which defined Renaissance Humanism as the final phase of the long Middle Ages, thus relegating it to an 'inferior' position, involuntarily bore political implications. By way of the case study below, however, I would also like to illustrate the liberating effects of Monfasani's flexible periodization on the politically less-committed fields of philology and literary history.⁸ The vicissitudes of Andreas Pannonius, who falls in between the medieval and renaissance interpretive paradigms, provide strong support for Professor Monfasani's claim: "As a practical matter, history cannot do without periodization. But periodization does more than define the past. It also defines the present."⁹

7 Respectively: *A magyar irodalom története 1600-ig*, ed. Tibor Klaniczay (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1964); *A magyar irodalom története 1600-tól 1772-ig*, ed. Tibor Klaniczay (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1964). During drafting and publication, Klaniczay offered political protection to scholars who represented a more tolerant, less ideological practice of Renaissance research. Two brief surveys address the crucial role played by Klaniczay in organizing Hungarian Renaissance scholarship in the post-war era: Aleksander Gieysztor, Paul Oskar Kristeller and Astrik L. Gabriel, "Tibor Klaniczay (1923–1992)," in *Klaniczay-emlékkönyv*, ed. József Jankovics (Budapest: MTA ITI, 1994), 7–9; Riccardo Scrivano, "Tibor Klaniczay il comparatista del Rinascimento," *ibid.*, 418–426. See also László Szörényi, "Introduzione alla recente storiografia sul Rinascimento in Ungheria," in *Italy and Hungary* (as in n. 3), 44–53.

8 The above-mentioned quiet May afternoon was preceded and followed by loud academic discussions, but looking back on them now, one can say that the structure of the new history of Hungarian literature to be published by HAS owes a lot both to the lecture and to the article on which it was based. See the proposal by the editors: Sándor Bene and Gábor Kecskeméti, "Javaslatok egy új irodalomtörténet elvi alapvetéséhez és régi irodalmi részének felépítéséhez," *Helikon Irodalomtudományi Szemle* (2009/1–2): 201–225. This proposal, published in *Helikon* (the literary theory review published by the Institute for Literary Studies of the HAS), was immediately preceded by the Hungarian translation of Monfasani's 2006 article (as note 2): John Monfasani, "A reneszánsz mint a középkor betetőző szakasza," transl. Nóra Dobozy, *Helikon Irodalomtudományi Szemle* (2009/1–2): 183–200.

9 Monfasani, "Renaissance as Concluding Phase," 178.

Periodization as Stigmatization

Andreas the Hungarian (Andreas Hungarus is the name appearing in the earliest sources), formerly a soldier of János Hunyadi, joined the Carthusians in Venice in the 1440s, presumably after returning from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. His deep theological learning was praised by renowned humanists at various stages of his life: he won the esteem of Candiano Bollani in Venice, Bornio da Sala in Bologna, and Bonfrancesco Arlotti in Ferrara. Andreas had moved in elite circles in Hungary, too, well before joining the Carthusians. As one of the confidants of János Hunyadi he was present at the christening of Hunyadi's son, Matthias, in Kolozsvár in 1444; during his stay in Italy he met István Várdai, who would later be raised to the cardinalate. He also mentions János Vitéz, the Primate of Esztergom, as one of his personal acquaintances alongside János, the bishop of Pécs and humanist poet popularly known as Janus Pannonius, to whom Ficino dedicated his commentary on Plato's *Symposium*. Andreas was the Vicar and then the Prior of the grandiose Certosa, endowed by Borso d'Este, and was a confidant of the *marquis*. It was during the years he spent at Ferrara that he wrote his first mirror for princes, *De regiis virtutibus* (1467), which was dedicated to Matthias Hunyadi; the codex, illuminated by Guglielmo Giraldi, became the first (or at least the earliest known) in the series of the Hungarian Corvinas. So everything was in place – the era, the milieu, the humanist connections, and even a name, the deliberately chosen *Pannonius* replacing *Hungarus* – for Andreas to go down in history as a Renaissance author. And everything was in place for his works – in addition to *De regiis virtutibus*, his *Ad Herculem libri duo* (1471), dedicated to Ercole d'Este, and his *Expositio ad Canticum Canticorum* (around 1459), a commentary on the *Song of Songs* – to be examined in the context of renaissance political and theological literature.¹⁰

10 On the above see my earlier studies: "Where Paradigms Meet: The Theology of Political Virtues in Andreas Pannonius' Mirrors for Princes," in *Italy and Hungary* (as n. 3), 173–215; and "Theology and Politics in Andreas Pannonius's Mirrors for Princes," *Camoenae Hungaricae* 6 (2009–2010): 39–83, which offers a more detailed curriculum of Pannonius. A very important contribution, with new biographical data from the Ferraran context (e.g., for the Arlotti contact) is Antonio Samaritani, "Borso d'Este, presenza certosina, spiritualità umanistica, pietà religiosa a Ferrara (II metà '400 – I metà '500)," *Analecta pomposiana: Studi di storia religiosa delle diocesi di Ferrara e Comacchio* 31–32 (2006–2007): 45–157. Presently I am working on a critical edition of the epistolary mirrors for princes. References henceforth follow the numbering of the letters as found in the manuscripts: *De regiis virtutibus ad Matthiam Hungarie regem* in Vatican City, BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 3186 (henceforth: *De regiis virtutibus*); *Ad illustrissimum principem dominum dominum*

And Andreas's situation remained just so for quite a while, until 1942 when the renowned scholar of medieval literature, János Horváth Jr., while preparing the critical edition of Andreas's *Expositio*, published an influential study examining its sources, and then extended the results to Andreas's political writings as well.¹¹ Horváth, by removing the Carthusian monk from the frivolous Renaissance context, had salvaged him for the 'more serious' medieval scholarship. In his conclusions Horváth claims that the commentary on the *Song of Songs* can be considered a 'mystical correlate' of the scholastic outlook that characterized the mirror-for-princes genre. The evidence Horváth produced (e.g., that Andreas did not use Ambrogio Traversari's translation when quoting Pseudo-Dionysius, and that he drew not on Platonist philosophy of mind but instead on the pseudo-Augustinian mystical work, *De spiritu et anima*) would hardly be considered convincing these days.¹² It seemed to be general practice for scholars in Bessarion's circle to use different translations;¹³ Denys the Carthusian also mentions that he used several different translations – Eriugena, Saracenus, Traversari – at the same time.¹⁴ And Andreas's recourse to *De spiritu et anima* is just an excellent example for the close links between medieval and Renaissance philosophies of mind (e.g., the humanist Pier Candido Decembrio wrote his *De humani animae immortalitate* based at length on this work).¹⁵ By 'medievalizing' Andreas, Horváth intended to raise the value of the

Herculem, ducem preclarissimum floride civitatis Ferrariensis, Mutine ac Regii, marchionem Estensem, Rodigique comitem etc. libellus per fratrem Andream Pannonium ordinis Chartusiensis editus, 1471, in Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS. á. Q. 9. 12 (henceforth: *Ad Herculem*).

- 11 János Horváth Jr., "Andreas Pannonius Cantica Canticorum kommentárjának forrásai," *Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny* 66 (1942): 257–287.
- 12 See Sándor Bene, "Renaissance or Medieval 'Mirror for Magistrates'? Andreas Pannonius' 'libelli' in Various Research Perspectives," in *Centers and Peripheries in European Renaissance Culture: Essays by East-Central European Mellon Fellows*, ed. György Endre Szónyi and Csaba Maczelka (Szeged: JATE Press, 2012), 25–42.
- 13 John Monfasani, "Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite in Mid-Quattrocento Rome," in *Supplementum Festivum: Studies in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, ed. James Hankins, John Monfasani and Frederick Purnell Jr. (Binghamton [N.Y.]: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1987), 189–219; republished in John Monfasani, *Language and Learning in Renaissance Italy: Selected Articles* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1994), IX, see esp. 200–202.
- 14 See Kent Emery Jr., "Twofold Wisdom and Contemplation in Denys of Ryckel," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 18 (1988): 105.
- 15 Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Pier Candido Decembrio and his Unpublished Treatise on the Immortality of the Soul," in Id., *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, I (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1985), 281–300; for Decembrio's text see 567–584.

Carthusian's oeuvre – but unfortunately being 'medieval' retained a positive connotation only for a short period of time; in the above-mentioned Marxist manual of Hungarian literature it was precisely that 'medieval' identity that condemned Andreas as antiquated and obsolete.¹⁶ Later this negative evaluation started appearing in international literature as well. It is most illuminating to listen to Raoul Manselli, a great medievalist, branding Andreas medieval:

Basti pensare al singolare *Libellus de virtutibus Matthiae Corvino dedicatus*, di Andrea Pannonio, composto in Italia, a Ferrara, ancora profondamente medioevale, sia nella forma estrinseca, che ricorda i vari e molteplici esempi di *specula principis*, sia – e più ancora – nella parte finale, ove ritorna in pieno, ma nella forma più consueta e tradizionale, l'esposizione delle teorie sulla fine dei tempi, senza che vi aleggi il benché minimo segno o indizio di novità. Non mancano, a dire il vero, specialmente nel resto dell'opera, citazioni di classici e ricordi del mondo antico, ma sono fregi illustrativi, decorazioni di abbellimento, non aspetti di una realtà culturale nuova o almeno rinnovata. Si prenda il capitolo relativo alle donne, vittime della tracotanza e della barbarie turca o l'altro 'De dotibus summi ducis bellorum' per renderci conto dei limiti culturali e spirituali di quest'aspetto speculativo del mondo umanistico ungherese.¹⁷

It is clear from this quotation that Professor Manselli did not take into account that when Andreas wrote *De regis virtutibus* he had been living in Italy for almost twenty-five years and was quite removed from Hungarian reality. But taking a closer look at the immediate sources of the criticized chapters, one encounters an even graver problem.

First Encounters – Andreas Pannonius's *De regis virtutibus* and Petrarch's *Seniles*

Both of Andreas Pannonius's mirrors for princes discuss the political issue of good government in a theological framework. A thematic concern they share is the happiness of the sovereign, since the satisfaction of his subjects and the peace and security of the state depend upon it. 'Happiness' in this case is a

16 *A magyar irodalom története 1600-ig* (as n. 7), 110.

17 Raoul Manselli, "Umanesimo ungherese ed umanesimo europeo: Primo tentativo d'un bilancio," in *Rapporti veneto-ungheresi all'epoca del Rinascimento*, ed. Tibor Klaniczay (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1975), 44–45.

theological term: to practice his virtues a sovereign must set out on the road that leads to seeing God face to face (*visio beatifica, fruitio Dei*, etc.) for that is the highest order felicity – *beatitudo* itself. But which virtues is he to practice to reach his final end?¹⁸ In the ancient philosophical tradition, contemplative, philosophical lifestyles unequivocally took priority over active ones.¹⁹ The most significant exception might have been Cicero, who secured a place among the *beati* in the celestial spheres for politicians defending and actively contributing to the progress of their country through political virtues. Moreover, their place is a privileged one, since “nothing that occurs on earth, indeed, is more gratifying to that supreme God who rules the whole universe” than states that allow practice of the virtues proper to an active lifestyle.²⁰ Macrobius’s Cicero commentary offers a compromise to harmonize the conflicting traditions.²¹ According to Macrobius, Cicero

did not say with finality that nothing is more gratifying to that supreme God than commonwealths, but added a qualification, *nothing that occurs on earth is more gratifying*. His purpose was to distinguish those who are primarily concerned with divine matters from the rulers of the commonwealths, whose earthly achievements prepare their way to the sky.²²

As a consequence, some can arrive at happiness through political virtues, others through contemplative ones:

-
- 18 In the last few years the topic has appeared at the center of new research, see: *Princely Virtues in the Middle Ages 1200–1500*, ed. István Bejczy and Cary J. Nederman (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007); and *Virtue Ethics in the Middle Ages: Commentaries on Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics, 1200–1500*, ed. István Bejczy (Leiden: Brill, 2008).
 - 19 Jill Kraye, “Moral Philosophy,” in *Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. Schmitt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 316.
 - 20 *De re publica*, VI, 13 (= *Somnium Scip.*, 3). See Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*, transl. William Harris Stahl (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), 71 (slightly modified).
 - 21 On the impact of the commentary on medieval political thought see: István Bejczy, “The Concept of Political Virtue in the Thirteenth Century,” in *Princely Virtues* (as n. 18), 9–32.
 - 22 *Comm. in somnium Scip.*, VIII, 12. “Iure ergo Tullius de rerum publicarum rectoribus dixit: ubi beati aeuo sempiterno fruuntur: qui ut ostenderet alios otiosis alios negotiosis uirtutibus fieri beatos, non dixit absolute nihil esse illi principi deo acceptius quam ciuitates, sed adiecit quod quidem in terris fiat, ut eos qui ab ipsis caelestibus incipiunt discerneret a rectoribus ciuitatum, quibus per terrenos actus iter paratur ad caelum.” *Macrobius*, ed. Franciscus Eyssenhardt (Leipzig: Teubner, 1868), 509; transl.: *Commentary on the Dream*, 123–124.

Si ergo hoc est officium et effectus uirtutum, beare, constat autem et politicas esse uirtutes: igitur et politicis efficiuntur beati.²³

No straight path, however, leads from the political virtues, found at the bottom of the Platonic fourfold hierarchy,²⁴ to those at higher levels. During *ascensio* only those who leave the public sphere (*a rerum publicarum actibus se sequestrant*) can have access to the purifying level.²⁵ Politicians are excluded from the process of further perfection, unless they abandon their political activities. So Macrobius's widely-known commentary does not, after all, resolve the dilemma; rather, his rhetorically-pleasing argument raises logical difficulties. And from this point onwards everything is a question of emphasis: those citing Macrobius's commentary will either emphasize his *expressis verbis* conclusions or focus on the different levels of the hierarchy of virtues and the difficulties of ascending from one level to another.

The Thomist school of Scholastic tradition clearly opted for the second version. According to the *Summa theologiae* it is "ridiculous to praise God by way of political virtues" (*ridiculum est enim secundum virtutes politicas Deum laudare*).²⁶ Thomas Aquinas spots the inconsistencies of Macrobius's argumentation (e.g., it is difficult or impossible to discuss the elevation of political virtues, if in order to do so these virtues have to shed their political features), and he goes on to stress the necessity of renouncing political virtues in order to get to higher levels of moral perfection (*deserere res humanas [...] virtuosum est*).²⁷ Now the Hungarian Carthusian Andreas Pannonius acquired his

23 *Comm. in somnium Scip.*, VIII, 12 (Macrobius, 509); cf. *Commentary on the Dream*, 123.

24 Macrobius attributed the idea of a hierarchy of virtues to Plotinus; however, it was Porphyry who developed the fourfold system. See Giovanni Catapano, "Alle origini della dottrina dei quattro gradi di virtù: Il trattato 19 di Plotino (Enn, I, 2)," *Medioevo* 31 (2006): 9–28.

25 *Comm. in somnium Scip.*, VIII, 8 (Macrobius, 508); cf. *Commentary on the Dream*, 122.

26 *Summa theol.*, I, quaest. 21. art. 1. ad 1. (Source of the Thomas-quotations, if not indicated otherwise: <http://www.corpusthomicum.org/iopera.html>).

27 *Summa theol.*, I–I, quaest. 61. art. 5. ad 3. He returns to this question later as well, arguing as follows: If political virtues are not identified with cardinal virtues, then it is possible to proceed towards *beatitudo*. The different kinds of these virtues (*species*), take different forms (*actus*) on the scale of ascension. See *Summa theol.*, I–II, quaest. 67. art. 1; and especially *De virtutibus*, quaest. 5. art. 4., with respect to arg 7. and response "ad 7". Thus Thomas follows the tradition that had been gaining strength since William of Auvergne, a tradition that disapproved of identifying *virtutes politicae* and *virtutes cardinales*, and questioned the validity of these virtues beyond this earthly, active life; see Bejczy, "Concept," 25–26. (In Thomas's words: "...[virtutes politicae]...ordinantur

training in the *via Thomae*. In accordance with Thomist teaching, he claims in his commentary on the *Song of Songs* that the wise ideas of past philosophers *ordinantur ad finem consequendum in presenti vita*:

quia scientie practice ab eis tradite ordinantur ad felicitatem politicam, loquendo de politica presentis vite. Et ideo scientia sacre scripture his eminet quia ordinatur ad eternam felicitatem quam philosophi ignorantur.²⁸

The very same duality of political happiness and eternal felicity, with the necessary priority of the latter, can be detected in his first mirror for princes dedicated to Matthias Hunyadi, though with a remarkable modification. Bishop Miklós Nyujtódi receives praise for *not* leaving the practical sphere of politics even after his theological studies, and for trying to achieve the two kinds of ‘happiness’ at the same time:

non contentus scientia practica que a philosophis traditur ad felicitatem politicam, quam adolescens adhuc plenissime didicit, sed etiam scientiam speculativam que ad felicitatem contemplativam pertinet, excellentissime ebibit, per quam et altissimas causas speculari possit.²⁹

But the dilemma (that is, the incompatibility of the virtues characterizing the contemplative and active lifestyles) remains a dilemma, at least on a theoretical level.

tantum ad perficiendum homines in vita civili, non secundum quod ordinantur ad caelestem gloriam consequendam,” *De virtutibus*, quaest. 5. art. 4. corpus). The problem is that Macrobius did not make such a distinction in terminology – theologians following in his footsteps (such as William of Auxerre, Roger Bacon, Robert Kilwardby and Bonaventura) considered the practice of political virtues a means of attaining salvation. They thought these virtues, helped by *caritas*, could prepare one for happiness because, although political virtues are acquired virtues (*virtutes acquisitae*), their intrinsic principle (*principium intrinsecum*) is *caritas* itself. On this trend, see Bejczy, “Concept,” 28–30. On Bonaventura’s interpretation of Macrobius, see. Kent Emery Jr., “Reading the World Rightly and Squarely: Bonaventure’s Doctrine of Cardinal Virtues,” in Id., *Monastic, Scholastic and Mystical Theologies* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1996), nr. 1. (183–218), esp. 207–212.

28 Andreas Pannonius, *Super Cantica Cantorum Salomonis Expositio devotissima*, Budapest, Hungarian National Library Széchényi, Cod. Lat. 443, fol. 21v. The critical edition of the work is being prepared by Csilla Bíró, who kindly provided the transcript of the codex. See also Bene, “Where Paradigms Meet,” 187–188.

29 *De regiis virtutibus*, fol. 105r–v.

A viable solution is offered by Franciscan Scholasticism, whose greatest representative, John Duns Scotus, built his system of virtues leading to *beatitudo* not on the intellect but on another faculty of the soul, the will. In his view, it is not *cognitio* but *caritas* that leads the soul seeking salvation to *visio*. Though Scotus did not have an elaborate political philosophy of his own, his ideas indirectly helped to attach a higher value to political virtues, since the spiritual potential of the will (e.g., in the form of mutual love linking the sovereign with God and God with the sovereign) played a decisive role in establishing successful practices of those virtues.³⁰ It is no accident that Giles of Rome, one of the most influential political thinkers of the Middle Ages, tried to find a solution by reconciling the intellectualism of Thomism and the voluntarism of Scotism.³¹ In the relevant chapter of his *De regimine principum* (1, i, 12. *Quomodo in amore Dei, et in actu prudenti, est quaerenda felicitas*), Giles states that the happiness of the sovereign consists in his knowledge of God and in a communion with Him, and that the road to Him is through active love (*actus dilectionis sive caritatis*). By loving God, the sovereign can approach happiness already in his earthly life, if he rules by obeying God, i.e., by exercising prudence (*per prudentiam*). So the political happiness of the sovereign (and, indirectly, of his subjects) derives from linking these two virtues, prudence (*prudentia*) and love (*caritas*): *Regibus et principibus ponenda est felicitas in actu prudentiae, non simpliciter, sed ut est imperatus a caritate*.³²

In Andreas Pannonius's first mirror, *De regiis virtutibus*, the most often cited (though unnamed) source is Giles's *De regimine principum*, though Andreas

30 See Antonie Vos, *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 440–446; Roberto Lambertini, "Aspetti etico-politici del pensiero di Duns Scoto," in *Etica e persona: Duns Scoto e suggestioni nel moderno* (Convegno di studi, Bologna, 18–20 febbraio 1993), ed. Silvestro Casamenti, O.F.M. (Bologna: E.F.B., 1994), 35–86.

31 Zdislaw Kuksewicz, "Free Will and Free Choice," in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy (1100–1600)*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny and Jan Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 637.

32 Aegidius Columna, *De regimine principum libri III, per Hieronymum Samaritanum* [...] in lucem editi (Rome: Zanetti, 1607), 39. On Giles's work see: Jürgen Miethke, *Le teorie politiche nel medio evo*, ed. and trans. Roberto Lambertini (Genova: Marietti, 2001), 94–104; and Maurizio Viroli, *From Politics to Reason of State: The Acquisition and Transformation of the Language of Politics 1250–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 36–44; on political intelligence in *De regimine*: Roberto Lambertini, "Tra etica e politica: La 'prudentia' del principe nel 'De regimine' di Egidio Romano," *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 3 (1992): 1–75.

did not find Giles's concordist solution entirely feasible.³³ Instead, Andreas held that to solve this problem of moral philosophy a theological framework was necessary. So to the analysis of cardinal virtues he added the analysis of three theological virtues, and he argued that the prince's task lay in practicing these virtues,³⁴ and in meditating on the four ultimate things (death, the Last Judgement, damnation and salvation):

Hec sunt quatuor incitamenta tuorum spirituum, o rex sapientissime, que faciunt te cognoscere miserias huius perituri seculi et a peccatis retrahunt atque ad amorem tui creatoris redire compellunt.³⁵

The moral dictate of meditation introduced by Andreas might not resolve the problem of reconciling the two different kinds of 'happiness,' but it at least formally links them in a dynamic construction. The higher order happiness becomes achievable by the same means (through contemplation and meditation) as the lower (political) happiness; the meditation *de quatuor novissimis* becomes a prerequisite of successful government as well.

In this reading of Andreas's project, it appears distinctly revisionist. Linking theological virtues with political ones at first seems like a nostalgic return to an earlier phase of scholasticism, even to twelfth-century *vitae sanctorum*, which placed spiritualized political virtues in the biographies of their saints as godly gifts. Or it seems a return to Abelard's *Theologia Christiana*, which draws a parallel between these virtues and the teachings of Christ.³⁶ But of course Andreas's procedure is more self-conscious than it seems at first sight. One of his contemporary sources was *De principe* by Bornio da Sala, a Bolognese humanist and jurist. This work has attracted the attention of scholars in many respects, thanks to its Platonism, its discussion of the immortality of the soul from a politico-philosophical aspect, and its complex political

33 On the problems with the compatibility of *caritas* in Giles's system see Domenico Taranto, "Egidio Romano e il 'De regimine principum': Mutazioni concettuali nel paradigma degli *specula*," *Il Pensiero Politico* 37 (2004): 360–386, which concludes: "...mi sembra che, ancorché postulata, la carità non trovi poi adeguato spazio nello specifico della politica" (386).

34 "Ista tria prenotata erunt bona anime tue, rex inclite, in eterna felicitate, si in presenti veram fidem, spem certam et karitatem non fictam in deo tuo habueris." *De regiis virtutibus*, fol. 102r.

35 *De regiis virtutibus*, fol. 74r.

36 Bejczy, "Concept," 12.

terminology.³⁷ Bornio's *De principe*, dedicated to Borso d'Este, was written a few years before Andreas's *De regis virtutibus*, and taking into consideration the well-documented acquaintance of the two authors,³⁸ it is possible that Andreas directly 'answered' Bornio by discussing theological virtues in detail. Although Bornio emphasizes the importance of political virtues *respectu vite beate*, he only focuses on the four relevant political virtues *respectu vite civilis*: Bornio explains, *non enim ratio instituti exposcit, neque temporis, neque studii, ut prolixum opus efficiam*. Andreas's construction challenges this typically Thomist assertion³⁹ by discussing the virtues of faith, hope, and love (a discussion in which Andreas answers Bornio by paraphrasing him).⁴⁰

This seemingly archaizing attitude, however, is coupled with an innovative gesture. Requiring the ruler to meditate on the four last things establishes a link with the *devotio moderna*, which can be clearly seen in the fact that Andreas's words about the "four incitements of the soul" (quoted above) follow and paraphrase Geert Groote's well-known sermon on *meditatio mortis*.⁴¹ To recommend a devotional attitude to someone who by profession lives an active life is anything but the gesture of medieval scholastic political literature.⁴² And since it was Petrarch who cast the dynamic tension between these two lifestyles in

37 Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Vita attiva e vita contemplativa in un brano inedito di Bornio da Sala e in San Tommaso d'Aquino," in Id., *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, IV (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1996), 185–196; Luisa Pesavento, "'Quaedam lex animata': Il principe di Bornio da Sala," *Nuova rivista storica* 72 (1988): 1–22; James Hankins, "De republica: Civic Humanism in Renaissance Milan (and Other Renaissance Signories)," in *I Decembrio e la tradizione della Repubblica di Platone tra Medioevo e Umanesimo*, ed. Mario Vegetti and Paolo Pissavino (Naples: Bibliopolis, 2005), 496–497.

38 Bene, "Where Paradigms Meet," 178–179.

39 On Bornio's Thomism, see Paul Oskar Kristeller, "The Active and Contemplative Life in Renaissance Humanism," in Id., *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, IV, 208.

40 Bornio da Sala, "De ortu quattuor virtutum cardinalium et theologiarum" (*De Principe*, I; Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS A 83); cf. *De regis virtutibus*, 19r. (I owe thanks to Luisa Pesavento for her transcription of the Bornio da Sala manuscript.)

41 Groote thinks that meditation urges the soul onward, so that, condemning earthly things, it may return to its Creator "incitantia spiritum hominis ut spretis omnibus mundanis, ad suum redeat Creatorem"), while Andreas calls upon Matthias Hunyadi to be aware of all earthly struggles and misery and to abstain from sin. Cf. Geert Groote, "Quod meditatio mortis facit hominem se humiliare," in *Archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis, inzonderheid van Nederland*, ed. Nicolaas C. Kist and Herman J. Royaards, III (Leiden: J. Luchtmans, 1831), 47–48.

42 James M. Blythe, "Civic Humanism and Medieval Political Thought," in *Renaissance Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections*, ed. James Hankins (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 71. On the innovative role of Petrarch in this respect, see *ibid.*, 72.

high literary form, it is logical that when Andreas quotes Groote he then carries on for pages with passages taken from Petrarch's famous *contempus mundi* letter (*Sen.*, XI, 11) and his *De otio religiosorum*. Petrarch's monastic writings – *De otio* and *De vita solitaria* – enjoyed immense popularity in Carthusian circles: a great number of copies of these works circulated in charterhouses all over Europe.⁴³ Andreas Pannonius was familiar with both and quoted them in his commentary on the *Song of Songs*, too.⁴⁴

Now the presence of Petrarch's *Seniles* and *De otio* in Andreas's work would not necessarily require that Andreas bear the label 'Renaissance' – except for the fact that it now is certain that these were not the only works of Petrarch that Andreas Pannonius knew. Not once does he mention Petrarch's name. However, while working on the critical edition of Andreas's *De regis virtutibus*, I have found 27 Petrarch quotations altogether: seven from *De otio*; 19 from *Seniles*, and one from *De viris illustribus*. Although it must be noted that out of the 19 *Seniles* references, nine come from the first letter of Book IV and three from the first letter of Book XIV, nonetheless, Andreas quotes from eight different letters from the collection. Thus I feel justified in stating that Andreas had access to all the *Seniles*, which was no accident, since the library of the Certosa in Ferrara was well-equipped: Borso d'Este had purchased the whole library of the late humanist Giovanni Aurispa for the monks, and it contained *Seniles*.⁴⁵ The two extensively quoted epistles circulated separately as well (they also appeared in the earliest Petrarch editions excerpted from the original

43 Denis D. Martin, *Fifteenth-Century Carthusian Reform: The World of Nicholas Kempf* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 243–244.

44 Csilla Bíró, "Petrarca-idézetek Andreas Pannonius fennmaradt műveiben," in "... mint az gyümölcsös és termett szőlőveszszóc...": *Tanulmányok P. Vásárhelyi Judit tiszteletére*, ed. Bernadette Varga and Ágnes Stemler (Budapest: OSzK-Balassi Kiadó, 2010), 361–371. In this and another of her publications ("Andreas Pannonius és Petrarca 'De viris illustribus' című életrajzgyűjteménye," in *Szöveg-émlék-kép*, ed. László Boka and Judit P. Vásárhelyi [Budapest: Bibliotheca Nationalis Hungariae-Gondolat Kiadó, 2011], 62–76), Bíró collected several Petrarch quotations she found in Andreas Pannonius's works. My conclusions are different from hers. She and I both identified: *De regis virtutibus*: Appendix 1/2, 3, 6, 22; *Ad Herculem*: Appendix 11/2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 29, 30, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 50. Her indications of the *loci* taken from the Scipio biography do not correspond to mine; the reason is that Andreas used the β version of the text (and not the γ variant as Bíró claims).

45 Adriano Franceschini, *Giovanni Aurispa e la sua biblioteca* (Padua: Antenore, 1976), 24–25. (A later list of books from the sixteenth century also contains *Seniles*; cf. Samaritani, "Borso d'Este," 85.) On the foundation and significance of the Certosa see Charles M. Rosenberg, "'Per il bene di... nostra ciptà': Borso d' Este and the Certosa of Ferrara," *Renaissance Quarterly* 29 (1976): 329–340; Giovanni Leoncini, *Le certose della "Provincia*

collection).⁴⁶ Let us take a look at them, to ascertain how and to what purpose the Hungarian author used them.

Petrarch speaks in the Matthias mirror for princes even before Andreas Pannonius does. *De regiis virtutibus* starts off with a page-long quotation from *Seniles* IV, 1, which is Petrarch's *adhortatio* to his friend, Luchino dal Verme, the *condottiere* of Venice who led the Venetian army to suppress the 1363–64 revolt in Crete. The piece, entitled *De officio et virtutibus imperatoriis* in separate editions and manuscripts, describes the characteristics of an ideal military leader, paying particular attention to the balance between knowledge gained from experience, on the one hand, and from consulting books on military leadership, on the other. Apart from the introductory page, the more extensive quotations can typically be found in Andreas's chapters discussing war and the characteristics of the ideal supreme commander (*De bellis; De dotibus summi ducis bellorum*) but unmarked and unacknowledged quotations also come up in the chapters *Quare Christiani traduntur in manibus paganorum?* and *De mansuetudine et clementia*. Andreas's extensive borrowing can be explained by the fact that the military leaders whom Petrarch holds up as examples for Luchino are all generous and merciful. Highlighting these virtues allows Andreas Pannonius to showcase his ideal (and former) commander, János Hunyadi, among the greatest classical figures: Alexander, Scipio, and Hannibal. As Andreas claims:

Accedit ducibus preclarissimis bellorum suavitas facilitasque animi, et est his confinis equalitas quedam familiaritasque cum exercitu, que res maxime milites amantissimos ducum facit. In quibus qui amplius inter duces gentilium quam Alexander Macedo, Hannibal et Scipio Africanus, et Christianorum dux excellentissimus Johannes de Hunyad, tuus genitor precarissimus resplenduit?⁴⁷

The other Petrarchan letter from which Andreas often quoted, circulated under the title *De republica optime administranda liber*. At first it might seem to have been important for the Hungarian because it provided a convenient literary

Tusciae," vol. 2 (Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Universität Salzburg, 1989), 315–347.

46 See e.g. Franciscus Petrarca, *De republica optime administranda liber – De officio et virtutibus imperatoriis liber* (Bernae: Jean Le Preux, 1602); cf. Franciscus Petrarca, *Opera quae extant omnia* (Basel: Henricus Petri, 1581), 372–386 (*De republica optime administranda*); 386–392 (*De officio et virtutibus imperatoriis*).

47 *De regiis virtutibus*, 59r.

example for the praise of both János Hunyadi and his son, Matthias. Petrarch wrote this lengthy epistle to Francesco da Carrara, the *signore* of Padua (*Ad magnificum Franciscum de Carraria Paduae dominum, qualis esse debeat qui rem publicam regit*), who was the son of Jacopo da Carrara (Petrarch's previous patron), so celebrating the son allowed the author to revere the father, too.⁴⁸ Andreas, however, might have had other motives as well. Although the actual political message of *De regiis virtutibus* is an exhortation, a call for Holy War against the Turks, the ideal leader is depicted as a *rex pacificus* capable of organizing agreement and concord, establishing peace. The king's power is held and derived from the love of the citizens, his subjects. This position is very briefly expressed in a quotation from Cicero (*Philippicae*, II, 13) – a quotation used by Petrarch and adapted by Andreas:

Ora te, o rex inclite, et vox Tulliana in libro Philippicarum: Karitate, inquit, et benivolentia septum oportet esse principem, non armis tantum.⁴⁹

Petrarch's letter to Carrara describes the political benefits and the practical ways that a king can procure and deserve his citizens' love. Andreas does not borrow the pieces of practical advice referring to the actual situation in Petrarch's Padua, but adopts instead the main idea of Petrarch's letter, that is, the necessity of a *caritas*- and *amor*-based government, which has as its ideal consequence the peace of the state. It is telling that Andreas places his chapter *De pace* at the end of the first part of *De regiis virtutibus*, right before the meditational unit and after the eulogy of the two Hungarian cardinals, János Vitéz and István Várdai. Andreas must have known of the growing tension between the hard-line anti-Turkish politics of the Hungarian prelates on one hand, and Matthias's *Realpolitik*, on the other. Thus the placement of *De pace* stands as a cautious, indirect message to the king.

De regiis virtutibus ends with a pastiche of Petrarchan epistolary rhetoric, which is well worth a look:

48 On the letter see Giovanni Ponte, "I consigli politici del Petrarca a Francesco da Carrara (Sen., XIV, 1)," in *Petrarca e la cultura europea*, ed. Luisa Rotondi Secchi Tarugi (Milan: Nuovi orizzonti, 1997), 121–127; Viroli, *From Politics*, 71–72; and Peter Stacey, *Roman Monarchy and the Renaissance Prince* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 145–156.

49 *De regiis virtutibus*, fol. 24r; see the Appendix below, item 25.

Sen., IV, 2.

Salve igitur Metelle Cretice, seu tu noster Scipio Veronensis, *servator civium, victor hostium, punitor sontium, militiae restaurator*. Tu nobis victoriam sine sanguine gloriosam, tu exercitum sine lite reducis incolumen, tu rei bellicae suas leges, tu captis civibus libertatem, tu *patriae pacem*, et perdita regna restituis.

De regiis virtutibus, c. "De beatitudine sanctorum," 106v–107r

Salve tu, Pannoniorum inclite princeps, *hostium victor, punitor sontium, militiae restaurator*, lex bellice artis, *liberator civium*, patrie decus, *pax patrie*, tu enim communis patrie laus et totius regni Pannoniensis gloria.

Sen., IX, 1.

In exitu Israel de Egipto, domus Iacob de populo barbaro facta est in celis gratulatio angelorum atque in terris hominum piorum. [...] O iterum te felicem, o felicem diem qui te matris ex utero in lucem edidit et ceu benignum sidus aliquod mundo dedit.

Facta est gratulatio angelorum in celis atque in terris hominum piorum iocunditas in die, qua illustrissima mater tua et utero te principem gloriosum et regem inclitum Pannoniorum populo edidit.

Sen., VII, 1.

Cristus omnipotens dies tuos proroget in longum evum aperiatque cor tuum consiliis non blandis, nec fortasse delectabilibus, sed sanis ac fidelibus.

Deus dominus Christus Ihesus omnipotens dies tuos proroget in longum aperiatque cor tuum consiliis pacemque tribuat...

The relatively great number of quotations is conspicuous in a 'medieval' text, but there is more to Andreas's enthusiastic borrowing than that. The most important effect Petrarch appears to have had on Andreas Pannonius concerns his choice of genre – at least in this initial phase when he is writing *De regiis virtutibus*. Andreas mentions several times that he is writing an epistle: that is why he aims for relative brevity;⁵⁰ that is why he places his ideal readers in

50 E.g. "Multa circa resurrectionem generalem essent dicenda, o rex sapientissime, que si prosequi velim, modum epistole excederem. Quapropter brevissime de hoc perorabo" (*De regiis virtutibus*, fol. 91r).

the king's presence (among them Janus Pannonius, the Bishop of Pécs).⁵¹ The whole work maintains the tone of a highly rhetoricized epistle. In addressing the reader, it is profoundly personal, imitating the style of the two *seniles* dedicated to Luchino dal Verme and Francesco da Carrara. And finally, Andreas confirms his choice of genre by opening and closing the whole *epistola exhortatoria* with long quotations from Petrarch. Thematically, as a work on political theory, *De regiis virtutibus* varies and alternates between the structure, on one hand, of Giles of Rome's work (balancing between Thomist intellectualism and Franciscan voluntarism) and, on the other hand, of Petrarch's letter to Francesco da Carrara, which scholars today consider "the first humanist mirror for princes."⁵² So the sources Andreas uses and the patterns he follows are the best ones available, not at all outdated in contemporary Ferrara.

What is more, following Petrarch sets Andreas apart from his contemporaries. The works of Tomaso Luiti, Michele Savonarola, and Bornio da Sala⁵³ are not in the least more modern than those of Andreas Pannonius. The Carthusian was highly inventive when combining classical and scholastic patterns with those of the *devotio moderna*, with its emphasis on a more personal religious experience. A contemporary of Andreas Pannonius, the mystical theologian Denys the Carthusian (Denys of Ryckel, 1402–1471, known as the *Doctor Ecstaticus*), did something similar by combining a mirror for princes and an epistle against the Turks. In *De regimine*, Denys talks about how a prince has to have the virtues of both the contemplative and the active lifestyles, and how, regarding the latter, he can proceed with the help of *devotio interna*.⁵⁴ Denys also concludes his work with a long quotation from Petrarch (drawn

51 Just like Miklós Nyujtódi, Janus Pannonius strives to attain both earthly and celestial happiness; his praise is worth quoting at length: "Aut certe per illum tuum seraphicum dominum dominum videlicet Johannem Pannonium, episcopum dignissimum Quinqueecclesiensem, cuius sapientia et oratio clarior sole stellisque lucidior altissimas causas perlustrans et ad inferiora diffundens. Eius namque eloquentia non solum Latine, verum etiam Grece admirabilis, et quasi Phryson fluvius de eius ore sapientia egreditur. Vox enim eius dulcis et sonora et quasi organum diversarum melodiarum causas virtutesque resonans. Non solum enim humanas, verum etiam divinas virtutes ita complectitur, ut et aliorum via et exemplar vite sanctitatis, ut decet prelatum, esse possit" (*De regiis virtutibus*, fol. 105r).

52 Miethke, *Teorie politiche*, 219. See also n. 48 above.

53 Bornio da Sala is an exception to some extent: he also quotes Petrarch, though not his prose but the *Epystole metriche* (II, 3, *Ad Bernardum Ruthensem*) and *Africa* (songs III and V).

54 Dionysius Carthusianus, "De vita et regimine principum," lib. II, art. 1, in Id., *Opuscula insigniora*, (Cologne: Ioannes Birckmann, 1559), 673.

from the famous digression in *De vita solitaria*).⁵⁵ But despite an explicit aim to theologize the ‘philosophical’ Giles of Rome, Denys did it not structurally (by explicating the theological virtues one by one) but by emphasizing the rhetorically persuasive use of theological discourse.⁵⁶

Andreas Pannonius is medieval in the sense that Petrarch is medieval. This observation is well-supported by Manselli’s harsh judgment (quoted above) – Manselli who, among others, cited Andreas’s chapter *De dotibus summi ducis* to illustrate the “cultural and spiritual barriers” reminiscent of the Middle Ages. Well, this short chapter consists of 470 words. Of these, 30 can be attributed to the Hungarian Carthusian; the rest, 440 words, are verbatim quotations from Petrarch’s letter to Luchino dal Verme.⁵⁷ The epistle does contain quotations and allusions to classics that ‘serve ornamental functions’ but it would be hazardous to say they reveal the characteristics of a ‘deeply medieval’ attitude, or that they had nothing to do with a “new or at least renewed” cultural experience.⁵⁸ But Andreas Pannonius did not stop here – his Petrarchan borrowings reached further.

A Radical Turn: The Political Theology of *Ad Herculem* and Petrarch’s *Familiares*

Cum enim immutabilis eterne divinitatis visionem perfruemur, nos quoque immortales et eterni in illo erimus, non idem quod ipse, sed similes participatione glorie eius, que per visionem sue essentie fit. Et talis comprehensio pertinet ad memoriam, que non distinguitur essentialiter ab intellectu, secundum beatum Thomam, sed secundum magistrum Johannem Scotum distinguitur etc. et correspondet spei. Per spem enim hic in presenti vita tua sublimitas ambulat, ut perveniat ad comprehensionem summe bonitatis, non tamen totalem.⁵⁹

ANDREAS PANNONIUS, *De regiis virtutibus*, CLOSING CHAPTER

55 Ibid., 735–736; cf. Francesco Petrarca, *De vita solitaria*, ed. Guido Martellotti, trad. ital. Antonietta Bufano (Turin: Einaudi, 1977), 196–218 (book II, ch. 9).

56 Dionysius, 642 (lib. I, art. 1): “Aegidius philosophice magis quam theologice loquitur ac procedit. Ego autem theologice potius quam philosophice intendo procedere: quo enim sacra scriptura dignior atque sublimior est quam philosophica doctrina, eo ad exhortandum, arguendum, docendum et inflammandum est aptior et omnino potentior.”

57 See in *Appendix*, I, items 13–15.

58 Cf. Paul Oskar Kristeller, “Il Petrarca nella storia degli studi,” in *Petrarca e la cultura europea*, 7–29.

59 *De regiis virtutibus*, fol. 102r (ch. “De beatitudine sanctorum”).

In the closing chapter of *De regiis virtutibus* (the mirror for princes dedicated to Matthias Hunyadi), Andreas Pannonius probes the limits of the Thomist system by referring to Scotus in a spirit of concord, although he does not carry through with the idea. A similar balancing and harmonizing effort appears in his quotation of a chapter-title from Book XII of Augustine's *De Trinitate* (*Beatus non est, nisi qui habet omnia quae vult, et nihil vult male*)⁶⁰ as a main theme. It turns up yet again in the fact that he 'illustrates' this voluntaristic theory, which played such an important role in Scotus's philosophy,⁶¹ by means of a quotation taken from Thomas that links the achievement of happiness with contemplative life.⁶² In the corresponding chapter of his second mirror for princes, *Ad Herculem I* (i.e., in the penultimate chapter of the first part of the work), Andreas made considerable changes to the text. The quotation from Aquinas that had appeared in the earlier *De regiis virtutibus* (*Deus autem spiritus est, ut dicitur Joannis quarto, unde nec aliquo sensu nec imaginatione potest videri, sed solo intellectu*)⁶³ now, in the *Ad Herculem* version, continues:

Apud tamen doctores duplex est opinio, utrum videlicet in intellectu aut in voluntate summa consistat beatitudo. Sed preclarior est opinio illorum qui in voluntate posuere beatitudinem, eo quod voluntas sit tam secundum sanctorum quam philosophorum opinionem dignissima ac perfectissima potentiarum anime.⁶⁴

Andreas's interpretive stance is clear: instead of insisting on the concordist way as he had done in *De regiis*, he now intends to resolve the problem of how the political virtues can lead to the sovereign's by drawing on Duns Scotus's voluntaristic, *caritas*-centered theology. In *Ad Herculem*, Andreas completely

60 Augustinus, *De trinitate*, XIII, 5 (PL, 42, 1020); cf. *De regiis virtutibus*, fol. 100v ("Beatus enim vere est, qui habet omnia quae vult et nihil vult male", ut Augustinus inquit XIII De trinitate").

61 In a broader context, see Richard Cross, *Duns Scotus* (New York: Oxford University Press), 1999), 61–71; and Vos, *Philosophy of John Duns Scotus*, 413–431.

62 "Ibi enim ipsam veritatem facie ad faciem videbis, quam nunc in speculo et enigmate per studium contemplative vite cernis." *De regiis virtutibus*, 100v; cf. *Summa contra gentiles*, lib. III, c. 63. n. 1–2. ("Est enim quoddam desiderium hominis in quantum intellectualis est, de cognitione veritatis: quod quidem desiderium homines prosequuntur per studium contemplativae vitae.")

63 *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 12. a. 3 corpus.

64 *Ad Herculem*, fol. 79r–v (ch. "Exhortatio ad conterendos infideles et ad felicitatem consequendam: capitulum XLIII").

rewrites the chapters treating the three theological virtues and – though leaving his main source unidentified – quotes and paraphrases Petrus de Aquila's *Sentences* commentary at length. The fourteenth-century Franciscan theologian Aquila was the era's most committed and successful divulgator of Scotus's views (an expertise that earned him the name 'Scotellus' and 'Doctor Sufficiens'). But for Andreas Pannonius, whose aim was not to write a scholarly tract but to instruct a worldly ruler in basic religious knowledge, Aquila's reliable synthesis provided a sound basis for a will-centered theology.⁶⁵ The academic community of contemporary Ferrara did not consider Aquila's work an outdated scholastic reference book. Andreas was not the only one who knew and used it. Francesco Marescalchi, the well-known platonizing humanist and close acquaintance and correspondent of Alberti, Bracciolini, Valla, and Ficino, also had Scotellus in his library; he bequeathed the volume to the Carthusian monastery, where he himself moved to spend the last years of his life.⁶⁶

Magisterial studies by Professor Cesare Vasoli long ago pointed out the significance of the Ferraran Franciscan milieu in establishing a connection between Scotism and Renaissance Platonism.⁶⁷ The examples of Marescalchi and Andreas Pannonius show that Carthusian spirituality also had catalyzed these connections. Note, however, that Andreas's Scotist turn was preceded and, I suspect, strongly motivated by an encounter with Francesco Petrarca. Carthusian sources reveal the story of an internal, monastic conflict that forced Prior Andreas to leave San Cristoforo in Ferrara and travel to the Grand Chartreuse in Grenoble to exonerate himself. As a result of the decision of the order's General Chapter, however, Andreas had to move to Pavia.⁶⁸ From Pavia,

65 On the importance of Aquila with respect to Andreas Pannonius, see Bene, "Where Paradigms Meet," 200–202.

66 Luciano Gargan, "Un possessore di opere albertiane: Francesco Marescalchi," *Rinascimento* 42 (2002): 381–397 (on the Aquila-codex: 390 and 397). See also Enrico Peverada, "Un corrispondente dell'Alberti in cura d'anime: Il canonico Francesco Marescalchi," in *Alberti e la cultura del Quattrocento*, ed. Roberto Cardini and Mariangela Regoliosi (Florence: Polistampa, 2007), 1–26.

67 Cesare Vasoli, "Notizie su Giorgio Benigno Salviati (Juraj Dragišić)," in Id., *Profezia e ragione: Studi sulla cultura del Cinquecento e del Seicento* (Naples: Morano, 1974), 16–127; and Id., "Tracce scotiste nella cultura 'platonica' quattrocentesca," in Id., *Immagini umanistiche* (Naples: Morano, 1983), 217–248.

68 The latest detailed account of the conflict is Samaritani, "Borso d'Este," 53–55. The choice of place might not be accidental. Andreas asked Geronimo Ranuzzi, an old Bolognese friend, to help him gain the support of Angelo Capranica, Cardinal Protector of the Carthusian Order, and although what actually happened cannot be reconstructed, the

he dedicated the new version of his work to Ercole d'Este, who in the meantime, after Borso's death in August 1471, had come to power in Ferrara; Andreas hoped to return to the city with the help of his new patron. Originally he might have considered casting Ercole in the role of the ideal supreme commander in the holy war against the Turks. If this had remained the case, he might have only needed to make slight modifications to the first mirror for princes, *De regiis virtutibus*, dedicated to Matthias Hunyadi. It was probably when Andreas was searching for sources and works on which to model the new, revised version, that he came across certain works of Petrarch that he had not known before.⁶⁹ He started to copy, as was his practice, without any reference to the author's name, and to build the excerpts in his own new text. However, the results went well beyond his prior expectations.

What remained in the new mirror for princes from the old one was the lengthy *De otio* and *Seniles* quotations (from Petrarch's letters 3 and 10 respectively). In addition to these, however, Andreas used a great number of quotations from his new sources. These included Petrarch's *Invective contra medicum*, *Secretum* and *De gestis Cesaris* (one quotation from each), as well as the biographies of *De viris illustribus* (ten quotations, two from the chapter on Alexander the Great, one from the chapter on Hannibal, and seven from the Scipio biography). All serve to praise Ercole d'Este in the highest humanist style. The organizational principles applied to the new mirror for princes are best illustrated by the revisions made to the part that also came up in Manselli's criticism. In *De regiis virtutibus*, Chapter 22, *Quare Christiani traduntur in manibus paganorum?* Andreas tells the miraculous story of a Christian woman captured by the Turks. Through ceaseless prayer, she so heroically resisted every temptation and avoided humiliation that her captors finally had to sell her to a Venetian merchant. But what she had feared from the pagan Turks, befell her in the hands of a lustful Christian, who raped her. She sought revenge and her prayers were answered: God sank the ship together with its sinful owner and cargo. Andreas

result is known: Pope Sixtus IV himself wrote a letter to the Carthusian General Chapter of Grenoble on behalf of Andreas (Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Arm. 39, vol. 14, f. 98r). Andreas might have received asylum in the Certosa of Pavia with the help of Ranuzzi, the grey eminence, an esteemed diplomat both in Bologna and the Holy See, and Jacopo Ammanati, the 'Cardinalis Papiensis,' a close correspondent of both Ranuzzi and János Vitéz.

69 An edition of *Familiares* could be found in the Certosa of Pavia; see Luciano Gargan, *L'antica biblioteca della certosa di Pavia* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1988), 35 (cat. 106).

offsets the clichéd, hagiographic nature of the parable⁷⁰ by inserting lengthy quotations from Petrarch's epistle to Luchino dal Verme (*Senilis* IV, 1), and, as I have already mentioned, he continues copying from this source until the end of the following chapter (Chapter 23, *De dotibus summi ducis bellorum*).⁷¹ The corresponding chapter 23 of *Ad Herculem* bears the same title as in *De regiis virtutibus* (*De dotibus summi ducis*), and includes a short quotation from the *Seniles* letter. In *Ad Herculem* chapter 22, *Quod non oportet fidere propriis viribus principem*, however, the story about the martyrdom of the Christian woman has been deleted. In its place appear four quotations from Petrarch, artfully combined to fill almost eight pages. These excerpts come from *Ad familiares* (XXII, 14), the Scipio biography, and the *Contra medicum* invective.⁷²

Arguably, of all Petrarch's works, the letter-collection *Ad familiares* had the greatest effect on Andreas Pannonius. In his second mirror for princes, Andreas takes twenty-five verbatim quotations from eighteen of the *Seniles*; some quotations are several pages long (see the concordance table in Appendix II below). Due to the number and significance of these quotations, the physiognomy and the character of Andreas's *Ad Herculem* differed considerably from his first mirror for princes; *Ad Herculem* has been 'modernized,' i.e., it approaches a more classically-correct humanist Latin. The changes, however, not only concern Latin style and the increased number of Petrarchan borrowings. Andreas also adopted some of Petrarch's ideas about the political virtues in the second mirror for princes. In particular, two *Familiares* written to Marco Portonario, Petrarch's young correspondent from Genoa, proved to be of great importance for Andreas's political thought. The Genoese youth wished to become a monk, but had been forced by his parents to study law. In two consolatory letters, Petrarch, following references to Sallust and Cicero in Macrobius (who remains unnamed), explains to the would-be monk that the political virtues make it possible to practice the *vita activa* so as to find salvation and join the blessed, the *beati*. The following table shows that in the key chapter, *Exhortatio ad virtutes*, of *Ad Herculem* four *Familiares* are deployed to illustrate a theologically optimistic approach to the *vita activa* of the ruler:

70 "Ceterum ne tuam serenitatem omnino rebus spiritualibus occupem" (*De regiis virtutibus*, fol. 54r).

71 Ibid., fols. 55r–56v.

72 See *Ad Herculem*, fols. 41r–44r.

Fam., XIII, 12.

Uberrima, fateor, mundi pars est
Africa: virorum optimus est Scipio; *sed
nulla tanta viri virtus est, nulla telluris
tanta fertilitas que sollicito cultore non
egeat. Nec coluisse semel sufficit, sed
semper insistere oportet, qui singularem
vel agri vel animi fructum cupit.*

Fam., V, 15.

*In Campum Martium omnes qui
nascimur vocati sumus; quidam tamen
nonnisi ad strepitum numerumque
complendum, quidam vero ut honores
et laborum premia percipiant.*

Fam., XX, 4.

Alioquin omnes homines unum
studium haberent, quoniam in rebus
omnibus unum excellere est necesse;
*quo si omnium mortalium pergat
intentio, quid de aliis fiet? [...] Bene
provisum est ut curarum atque actuum
humanorum varietas tanta esset, quo non
solum maiora minoribus, sed et minora
maioribus ornamento presidioque sint.
Non sum nescius, amice, de iuris civilis
studio multis olim magnam gloriam
quaesitam, ea scilicet aetate qua iustitia
ultra ab hominibus colebatur, quando
apud eos, ut ait Sallustius, ius bonumque
non legibus magis quam natura
valebat...*

Ad Herculem libri duo c. IV (8v–9v)

Et quamvis tua excellentia virtutibus
admodum refulgeat, presertim clementia
[...]; *nulla tanta viri virtus est, nulla telluris
tanta fertilitas que sollicito cultore non
egeat, sed semper insistendum est illi qui
singularem vel agri vel animi fructum cupit.*

*In campum enim huius mundi
turbulentissimi pleno acribus potestatibus
omnes qui nascimur regi celesti Christo
domino vocati sumus militandum. [...]
Quidam tamen non nisi ad strepitum
numerumque complendum, quidam vero ut
honores et laborum premia hic percipiant,
intendunt.*

Diverse tamen sunt vocationes ad
virtutum iter. *Si enim omnium mortalium
unum esset exercitium, quid de aliis fieret?
Bene igitur provisum est ab unico
summoque opifice, ut curarum atque
actuum humanorum varietas tanta esset,
quo non solum maiora minorum, sed et
minora maioribus ornamento presidioque
essent. Nec sum nescius, quod multis
principibus olim gubernatio rei publice
immortalem gloriam acquisivit, ea videlicet
etate, quando iustitia ultra ab hominibus
colebatur, quando apud eos, ut eleganter
Sallustius ait, ius bonumque non legibus
magis quam natura valebat.*

Fam., III, 12.

Novit figmentum nostrum figulus ille sidereus, scit quid nobis expediat et anime nostre; sepe inenarrabilibus modis, quibus se tramitibus adiri velit, insinuat. [...] Nec est quo te interim inutiliter natum putes, si patriam tuam, his presertim temporibus tui egentem, que, ut Plato vult, "ortus tui partem" sibi iure suo "vendicat", ope consilioque adiuvas. Notum est apud Ciceronem celeste illud Africani mei dictum: "Omnibus qui patriam conservaverint auxerint adiuverint, certum esse in celo diffinitum locum, ubi beati evo sempiterno fruuntur"; et quod sequitur: "Nichil enim esto" inquit, "principi illi deo qui omnem hunc mundum regit, quod quidem fiat in terris acceptius quam concilia cetusque hominum iure sociati, que civitates appellantur". [...] Nullum, ut dixi, genus hominum eorum qui in aliqua honesta exercitatione versantur, ab hoc tramite sit exclusum, constetque, iuxta Plotini sententiam, non "purgatoriis" modo "purgatique" iam "animi", sed "politicis" quoque "virtutibus" beatum fieri.

Novit enim figmentum nostrum figulus ille sidereus quid cuique expediat, et anime nostre sepe inenarrabilibus modis, quibus se tramitibus adiri velit, disponit suaviter. Quapropter non inutiliter te natum putes, si patriam tuam his presertim temporibus tui egentem, que ut Plato vult ortus tui partem sibi iure suo vendicat, ope consilioque adiuvas. Notum est apud Ciceronem celeste illud Africani dictum: Omnibus qui patriam conservarint, auxerint, adiuverint, certum esse in celo diffinitum locum, ubi beati evo sempiterno fruuntur. Et quod sequitur: Nihil enim est, inquit, principi illi deo qui omnem hunc mundum regit quod quidem fiat in terris acceptius quam concilia coetusque hominum iure sociati, que civitates appellantur. Constat ergo iuxta Plotini sententiam non purgatis modo purgatique iam animi, sed politicis quoque virtutibus beatum fieri posse.

Petrarch's ideas about political virtue appear to dominate Andreas's second mirror for princes: evidently Andreas appreciated Petrarch's solutions to the issues that had troubled his first mirror. And this solution – the possibility of *beatificatio* through political virtues – altered the underlying principles and thus the argument of the second mirror. Such a scenario is suggested by Andreas's editing decisions: in the chapter *Exhortatio ad virtutes* he placed the excerpts from Petrarch's letters right before the description of theological virtues, i.e., the chapter enunciated Andreas's thesis. This layout in turn suggests that although Andreas might have read Petrus de Aquila's commentary earlier, or might have heard about it during the Ferraran theological debates, it was

only after his encounter with Petrarch that Andreas could approach Aquila's commentary as the most suitable support for the Macrobius-Cicero thesis developed by Petrarch.

Andreas's new argumentation about political virtue unfolds as follows. According to Aquila, of the four cardinal virtues, only *prudentia* can be found in the rational part of the soul; temperance, courage, and justice are *in voluntate*, i.e., in the volitional part.⁷³ The cardinal virtues are connected (*connexae*) to one another and to the three theological virtues. Where the two spheres of the cardinal and the theological virtues meet, precisely at their point of intersection lies justice, the princely virtue *par excellence*, which Andreas, with some rhetorical exaggeration, calls the fourth theological virtue. One arrives at *beatitudo* through the virtues embedded in the volitional faculty of the soul, a claim that guarantees the superiority of will/affection over cognition (as was quoted above: "[the] will is [...] the worthiest and most perfect of all the faculties of human soul"). Thus Aquila's theology, by harmonizing Scotus and Bonaventura, offered Andreas a solid theological base to support his use of Petrarch's moral-philosophical arguments on the primacy of will.⁷⁴

Petrarch's harsh attack on scholasticism in *De ignorantia* does not entail a renunciation of scholastic reasoning *tout court*. By disapproving of one branch of scholasticism, Petrarch necessarily accepted another, either implicitly or explicitly. According to current scholarship, Petrarch's ideas, fusing an anti-intellectual and love-based morality with Augustinian voluntarism, "are conspicuously modern and apparently allude to a close and substantial parallelism with John Duns Scotus's positions."⁷⁵ Andreas seems to have recognized this compatibility when writing his second mirror for princes, dedicated to Ercole d'Este.

Andreas Pannonius's Petrarchan course is quite evident in the second part of *Ad Herculem*. The two-part structure of *De regis virtutibus* remains, but the meditational unit (that is, the ten chapters from chapter 28, *De meditatione regis* to chapter 37, *De beatitudine sanctorum*) is replaced in *Ad Herculem* by a detailed description of Borso d'Este's road to heaven. The princely virtues that

73 *Ad Herculem*, fol. 26r; cf. Petrus de Aquila, *Commentaria in quatuor libros sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi*, ed. Cipriano Paolini, III (Genoa: Tip. Nicolosio, 1908), 222. Scotellus (and Andreas as well) uses Bonaventura's classification, which considerably differs from that of Aquinas, cf. *De virtutibus*, q. 1 art. 12 to 25.

74 See esp.: *De sui ipsius et multorum ignorantia*, c. 149. Cf. Enrico Fenzi, *Petrarca* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2008), 58–62; and Giuseppe Mazzotta, *The Worlds of Petrarch* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), 81–83.

75 Fenzi, *Petrarca*, 63.

lead him to blessedness are linked to the catalog of virtues listed in the Sermon on the Mount and formalized by commentary tradition; Andreas equates each political virtue of the prince with different 'orders' of the blessed.⁷⁶ Borso d'Este is, in Andreas's depiction, a politician who meets the Ciceronian requirements:

Hunc ducem nostrum non inutiliter natum fuisse putemus qui patriam suam his presertim temporibus ope consilioque adiuvit.⁷⁷

Consequently, why should we doubt that he will ascend to heaven through his political virtues?⁷⁸

I suppose Andreas Pannonius's orientation towards Scotism might be attributed to the fact that he was looking for a tradition that could theologically justify Petrarch's standpoint (and his own Petrarchan turn as well).⁷⁹ To put

76 Cf. e.g., Hugo Ripelin, *Compendium theologiae veritatis in septem libros digestum*, book v, ch. 47–55, in Albertus Magnus, *Opera omnia*, ed. Auguste Borgnet, vol. 34, 1 (Paris: L. Vivès, 1895), 188–191.

77 *Ad Herculem*, fol. 101v.

78 "Si igitur fides, si spes, si caritas, si prudentia, si temperantia, si fortitudo, si iustitia ceteraque virtutes morales quas hic enumerare obmitto, ne modum epistole excedam, quibus Borsius noster refulgere in vita hac visus est, viam sternunt ad superos, si bonis et bene creatis spiritibus sedes ultima et eterna celum est, illuc ducem nostrum Borsium ascendisse cur ambigimus? [...] Cum igitur ducem nostrum sciamus tantis hic enituisse virtutibus, cur non pie credamus celesti in regno ad aliquem gradum beatitudinis ipsum ascendisse?" *Ad Herculem*, fol. 102r–v. Cf. fol. 101v (chapter "Miraculum") where Andreas quotes once again the words that he also quotes in the chapter "Exhortatio ad virtutum" – "Notum est apud Ciceronem [...] que civitates appellantur." See Appendix II, 20 below – the whole scene, in which the deceased Borso appears in a vision to the Carthusian, resembles and paraphrases the famous vision from *Somnium Scipionis*.

79 Regarding Petrarch's various 'turns,' see the classic study by Hans Baron, "Petrarch: His Inner Struggles and the Humanistic Discovery of Man's Nature," in *Florilegium historicale: Essays Presented to Wallace K. Ferguson*, ed. John Gordon Rowe and W.H. Stockdale (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), 19–51; esp. 30–32, and 35–36. Baron's explication of the Portonario letter played a crucial role in the well-known psycho-historical construction of Petrarch's 'original thrust' – 'change of heart' / 'crisis and turn' – 'vacillation and inner struggles.' The letter emphasizing *politicae virtutes* represented the first, quasi-civic humanist phase, while chapter 1, 4 of *De vita solitaria*, written in the 1340s, with its detailed description of the fourfold Plotinian hierarchy of cardinal virtues, illustrated the 'retreat,' i.e., Petrarch's move to place the political virtues at the lowest level on the scale of human perfection. I do not intend to discuss this question, debated often and exhaustively, regarding the dating of Petrarch's works; see Enrico Fenzi, "Dall'Africa al Secretum: Il sogno di Scipione e la composizione del poema," in id., *Saggi petrarcheschi* (Firenze: Cadmo, 2003), 306–364 (at 353); see also Marco Santagata, *I frammenti dell'anima:*

it differently, Andreas drew close to Franciscan views when he defended the *Immaculata*-thesis. But his shift from one scholastic philosophical stream to another, his abandonment of concordist arguments, and his adoption of a distinctly Scotist stance, all appear to stem from his new acquaintance with the works of a Renaissance author – or more exactly *the* Renaissance Author. By quoting Scotellus's work, on the one hand, and by strictly following in the footsteps of Petrarch, on the other hand, Andreas claims a distinct place on the map of intellectual history around 1471, when the second mirror for princes was born. In the years that followed (between 1472 and 1482), Benigno Salviati composed *Federicus sive de regno animae*, a theological study that rehabilitated Scotus's voluntaristic theology in a Platonic key.⁸⁰ In the following year (1473), Rudolf Agricola wrote a Life of Petrarch (*Vita Petrarcae*), which rehabilitated Petrarch as the father of renovation and emphasized the European dimension of Petrarchan humanism.⁸¹ It is perhaps no accident that Agricola wrote his work in Pavia, where Andreas Pannonius was then resident (and the place

Storia e racconto nel Canzoniere di Petrarca (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2004), 75–99, giving bibliography on the debate at 343. I would only like to note here that the contrast between the two quotations, which is used to support Baron's claim, is simply not there. The dating of the Portonario letter is uncertain; see the new edition of the letter with a commentary: Pétrarque, *Lettres familières – Rerum familiarum libri*, ed. Ugo Dotti, transl. André Longpré, 1 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002), 291–295 and 452–454. Moreover, not only in *De vita solitaria*, as Baron stresses, but also in the Portonario letter, Petrarch takes a clear stand, saying “actuosa Marthe sollicitudo non spernitur, quamvis sublimior contemplatio sit Marie.” This point was already noted by Karl A.E. Enenkel: see his edition of Francesco Petrarca, *De vita solitaria*, 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 438. Consequently, *De vita solitaria* should not be considered as a ‘retreat’ but a more systematic and complex explication of the issue presented in the Portonario letter, which, however, does not offer a definitive solution for the dilemma.

- 80 On dating, see Zvonimir C. Šojat, *De voluntate hominis eiusque praeeminencia et dominatione in anima secundum Georgium Dragišić* (c. 1448–1520): *Studium historico-doctrinale et edition Tractatus 'Federicus, De animae regni principe'* (Vicenza: LIEF, 1972), 132–133; Vasoli, “Tracce scotiste,” 238.
- 81 On the Pavia context, see Cesare Vasoli, “Rodolfo Agricola e la *Vita Petrarcae*,” in *Germania Latina – Latinitas Teutonica: Politik, Wissenschaft, humanistische Kultur vom späten Mittelalter bis in unsere Zeit*, ed. Eckhard Kessler and Heinrich C. Kuhn, vol. 1 (Munich: W. Fink, 2003), 241–257; and Agostino Sottili, “Notizie per il soggiorno in Italia di Rodolfo Agricola,” in *Rodolphus Agricola Phrisius, 1444–1485: Proceedings of the International Conference at the University of Groningen 28–30 October 1985*, ed. Fokke Akkerman – Arie J. Vanderjagt (New York: Brill, 1988), 79–95.

where most Petrarch manuscripts could be found, even if not all were in the library of the Certosa).⁸²

So when labeling Andreas Pannonius it would perhaps be advisable to return to traditional practice and simply call him a 'Christian humanist' in the broad (medieval Christian humanist) sense of the word.⁸³ The quotations he takes from the classics are not rhetorical, poetical, or deep moral-philosophical reflections, but neither do they serve a merely ornamental function, as Raoul Manselli supposed. Their function is rather to suggest and to demonstrate the harmony of Classical Antiquity and Christianity. In the chapter *De meditatione mortis* of *De regiis virtutibus*, Andreas quotes Cicero:

*Vox Tulliana est in libro Paradoxarum: Mors, inquit, terribilis est illis quorum cum vita omnia extinguuntur, non his quorum laus emori non potest.*⁸⁴

The quotation appears without comment, sandwiched between a reference to a psalm and a quotation from Augustine. This same Cicero citation appears in the second mirror, dedicated to Ercole,⁸⁵ in the chapter about Borso d'Este's political salvation (discussed above). Here, however Cicero's dictum from the *Stoic Paradoxes* is introduced by the following sentence:

Non ergo ducem nostrum quasi mortuum morte tertia plangere debemus. Revocat enim nos a planctu non solum multiplex divinarum scripturarum auctoritas, verum etiam vox Tulliana, que preclara libro Paradoxarum habetur: *Mors, inquit, terribilis est illis quorum cum vita omnia extinguuntur, non his quorum laus emori non potest.*

82 Pierre Nohac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*, vol. 1 (Paris: H. Champion, 1907), 87–115; Elisabeth Pellegrin, *La bibliothèque des Visconti et des Sforza ducs de Milan, au 15. siècle* (Paris: CNRS, 1955), 41–72; cf. Gargan, *L'antica biblioteca*.

83 For the definition, see Charles G. Nauert, "Rethinking 'Christian Humanism,'" in *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism*, 155.

84 *De regiis virtutibus*, fol. 75v.; cf. Cicero, *Paradoxa stoicorum*, II, 18.

85 *Ad Herculem*, fol. 101r–v.

Note the harmony of *divinae scripturae* and the *vox Tulliana*: it would be impossible to dream up a more beautiful Petrarchan idea⁸⁶ – especially since even the Cicero quotation that Andreas used was taken from Petrarch.⁸⁷

Umbrellas in Context

“One of the advantages of the Kristeller interpretation of Renaissance humanism is that it does not require us to ascribe an ideology to a humanist or to measure a humanist in terms of a supposed common ideology,” says John Monfasani in the introduction to another, more strictly philological article.⁸⁸ I believe, *mutatis mutandis*, that the same could be said of every ‘medieval’ author and of the common ideological definitions of ‘medievalism.’ I myself have exercised that freedom here – accepting it as part of the inheritance left to contemporary scholarship by Kristeller – to analyze the political works of Andreas Pannonius from the perspective of both humanism and scholasticism.

Andreas’s two mirrors for princes were published in print almost a hundred and thirty years ago, but without any explanatory notes.⁸⁹ The plain texts have always reminded me of Nietzsche’s famous note, “I have forgotten my umbrella,” a note without any particular context, so that whether it refers to a real umbrella or to a text referring to an umbrella remains a mystery. Literary historians examining Andreas Pannonius’s works, did not, of course, reach the intellectual heights of Jacques Derrida, who, contemplating the lack of context for Nietzsche’s note, suggested a “hypothesis that the totality of Nietzsche’s text

86 Andreas’s fellow Carthusians loved to read Petrarch too. Indeed, they loved it so much that in order to make the reading easier they crossed out the unnecessary (pagan and classic) allusions, just as Arnold the Carthusian did in *De vita solitaria* (see Martin, *Fifteenth-Century Carthusian Reform*, 244). Andreas Pannonius did exactly the opposite: he sought to emphasize the unity of the Christian teaching and the Antique tradition.

87 *De otio religioso*, II, viii, 6; see in Pétrarque, *De otio religioso – Le repos religieux*, ed. Cristophe Carraud (Grenoble: Jérôme Millon, 2000), 360; cf. *Il ‘De otio religioso’ di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. Giuseppe Rotondi (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1958), 98.

88 John Monfasani, “Angelo Poliziano, Aldo Manuzio, Theodore Gaza, George of Trebizond, and Chapter 90 of the *Miscellaneorum centuria prima* (With an Edition and Translation),” in *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism*, 243.

89 Andreas Pannonius, *Libellus de virtutibus Matthiae Corvino dedicatus; Libellus ad Herculeum Estensem. Két magyarországi egyházi író a xv. századból: Andreas Pannonius, Nicolaus de Mirabilibus*, ed. Vilmos Fraknói and Jenő Ábel (Budapest: Magyar Tudomány Akadémia, 1886), 1–283.

might well be of the type 'I have forgotten my umbrella.'⁹⁰ Instead, they carelessly glued semantically loaded, ideological labels to the mirrors for princes.⁹¹ This activity was made easier by Andreas's irregular references. He only names a few classics (Plato, Aristotle, Seneca, Cicero, Sallust), Fathers of the Church (Dionysius the Areopagite, Augustine, Jerome) and very rarely the 'holy doctor' Thomas Aquinas. He deliberately conceals and almost never mentions his secondary and contemporary sources. These references are important, however, as my work on the critical edition reveals. Besides references to Bartholomew the Englishman, Giles of Rome, Bornio da Sala, and Petrus de Aquila, those to Petrarch are the most numerous and significant.

An interpretation depends on one's distance from the object to be interpreted, but to find the appropriate distance one can begin by stepping closer. Very close, in fact, so that every detail and element can be made out. The example of Andreas Pannonius is just one among many that illustrate how strong paradigms can block the interpreter's view. In Hungarian literary history, as I have already mentioned, strong paradigms have meant strong ideological bonds as well, at least until very recently. Kristeller's broad definition, emphasizing the rhetorical nature of Renaissance humanism⁹² was, of course, not free of ideological presupposition itself,⁹³ but nonetheless it allowed the greatest freedom possible for philological work. And, in turn, John Monfasani's proposal for periodization offers the greatest freedom possible for a literary historical narrative. National (or regional) literary history is compelled to view its object from a considerable distance. The "Renaissance as the Concluding Phase of the Middle Ages" model seems to work very well in the case of Andreas Pannonius, not only because it places him in a fitting cultural context, but also

90 Jacques Derrida, *Spurs: Nietzsche's Style*, transl. Barbara Harlow (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 133. Derrida's particular aim was to undermine Heidegger's hermeneutical interpretation of Nietzsche; see Alexander Nehamas, *Nietzsche: Life as Literature* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), 16–17. See also Quentin Skinner, "Significato, atti linguistici e interpretazione," in Id., *Dell'interpretazione*, transl. Raffaele Laudani (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2001), 146–147.

91 See, e.g., Bene, "Where Paradigms Meet," 175.

92 "[H]umanism must be understood as a characteristic phase of what may be called the rhetorical tradition in Western culture," said Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Humanism and Scholasticism in the Italian Renaissance," in Id., *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strains* (New York: Harper, 1961), 11. Cf. John Monfasani, "Toward the Genesis of the Kristeller Thesis of Renaissance Humanism: Four Bibliographical Notes," *Renaissance Quarterly* 53 (2000): 1156–1173.

93 Angelo Mazzocco, "Introduction," in *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism*, 13–14.

because it allows his oeuvre, formerly perceived as rather scattered, to appear instead as integral, a whole.

Obviously a certain distance must be kept from ideological dictates (let us call the current dictates ‘extreme presentism’) but it does not follow that philological ‘facts’ should always be directly accessible to the historian. They often can be collected from earlier – sometimes partial and tendentiously presentist – narratives, which can be explicit, even cultic ones but can also manifest themselves through more indirect forms of intertextuality (e.g., through the edition of canonical anthologies or the critical edition of national classics).⁹⁴ From this perspective, the relevant literary-historical question concerning Andreas Pannonius is not whether he is a Renaissance author (yes, he is), whether he is a humanist (yes, partly), or whether he has got anything to do with modernity (no, he has not). The relevant questions are rather how long ‘Petrarch’ persisted as a discourse matrix, as an encyclopedia,⁹⁵ as a living tradition in Hungarian literature, and what Andreas’s place is in that lengthy account. When did Petrarchan discourse become the subject of historical reflection? And if our answer to this question is that Petrarch’s is a name suitable for literary-historical periodization, since he is present in Hungarian literature from the times of medieval codices up to the end of the eighteenth century (for the last wave of Petrarchism overlaps with sentimentalism), then other questions follow. Which Petrarch and when? What are the different phases of the literary reception of his penitential psalms, of the moral-philosophical writings, of the Latin and then the vernacular poetical works? And then, from a comparatistic perspective, how and to what extent does Hungary’s reception of Petrarch differ from that of other Central European literatures?

It will come as no surprise if the conclusion I draw is that the plausible answers to these questions will be compatible with Professor Monfasani’s thesis. Taking into consideration a certain delay, a ‘phase difference’ (which, based on Monfasani’s hints, we might call “the Baroque as the concluding phase of the Renaissance”),⁹⁶ Hungary’s Modernity starts at the turn of the eighteenth century. And this should not be such a startling discovery if we consider the melancholy remark of Tibor Klaniczay, editor-in-chief of the first two volumes

94 See, e.g., Angelo Mazzocco, “Petrarch: Founder of Renaissance Humanism?” in *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism*, 215–242.

95 Earlier Petrarch editions (Basel, 1554, 1581) emphasized the encyclopedic nature of the oeuvre already on the cover page, as Mazzocco, “Petrarch: Founder,” 236, points out. Concerning the dynamics of Petrarch’s Italian reception, Amedeo Quondam, *Petrarca, l’italiano dimenticato* (Milano: Rizzoli, 2004) is of critical importance.

96 See further Bene and Kecskeméti, “Javaslatok,” 212–213.

of the above-mentioned Marxist history of literature, half a century ago: "If we are to remain consistent, the Hungarian Middle Ages should be considered to conclude only around the end of the eighteenth century."⁹⁷

Tibor Klaniczay then hastily dispelled the dream of scholarly consistency by returning to the Marxist discourse of productive forces and their epiphenomenal derivative, literature. This *retractatio*, as seen from the present, was the sad result of an unavoidable ideological self-restraint. But it would be mistaken to claim that the disappearance of this ideological interpretative framework has ushered in an era of absolute freedom. Even if we succeed in keeping our own presentism in check, that does not mean we can forget about the often radical presentism of older generations (e.g., that of Petrarch, his followers and commentators up to these days, "in the footsteps of the ancients").⁹⁸ Periodization, as John Monfasani has also said, is never innocent, and it describes the present as much as it describes the past. In Eastern Europe, perhaps more than in some other parts of the world, a good amount of historical experience might enable us to say that it is not irrelevant whether our freedom has epistemological or political boundaries. To put it differently, even a relative intellectual freedom is better than writing literary history under ideological control, no matter which direction the dictates take. What is more, literary history (a typical humanist invention!)⁹⁹ could itself be used at times to resist restrictions on the freedom of expression. One might find it outdated, an old-fashioned subject, like Paul Oskar Kristeller's famous black umbrella, which – unlike the other umbrella mentioned above – still offers protection for so many, no matter the color of the rain. Returning to that quiet lecture in May, I do believe many of us feel grateful to Professor Monfasani for passing that umbrella on.¹⁰⁰

97 Tibor Klaniczay, "Az irodalomtörténeti szintézis néhány elvi kérdése," in id., *Marxizmus és irodalomtudomány* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1964), 46.

98 See, e.g., Nancy Struever's programmatic introduction, "The Uses of the Present," to her analysis of Petrarch's ethics in his epistolary in "Petrarchan Ethics: Inventing a Practice," in Ead., *Theory as Practice: Ethical Inquiry in the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), respectively ix–xiii and 3–34.

99 For Hungary, in a European context, see, e.g., Gábor Kecskeméti, "A historia litteraria korai történetéhez," *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 109 (2005): 3–17.

100 A lesson on how to react to restrictions on intellectual liberties has never been so wittily offered as by Paul Oskar Kristeller, the scholar who was forced to leave Europe, fleeing Nazi persecution. When the 1968 Columbia protests erupted, Kristeller, unlike several of his new colleagues, "refused to be bullied. He held classes in his apartment and took to carrying his umbrella as a last line of defense against threats of violence. The illiberalism of the radical Left on campus was no more justified in his eyes than that of the Nazis at German universities a few decades earlier. Kristeller declared: 'I did not back down to the

Appendix A¹⁰¹1 *Quotations from Petrarch in Andreas Pannonius' De Regiis Virtutibus*

De Viris Illustribus

(Francesco Petrarca, *De viris illustribus*, edizione critica per cura di Guido Martelotti, I, Florence, 1964)

1. Ipse vero legionibus et classibus exercendis [→] ... qua concussa erant reliquum tempus egit. (De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano" [β], II, 8; ed. 164) = De dotibus summi ducis bellorum (55v)

De Otio Religioso

(Pétrarque, *De otio religioso – Le repos religieux*, introduction, traduction et notes de Christophe Carraud [Grenoble: Millon, 2000]; cfr. *Il "De otio religioso" di Francesco Petrarca*, a cura di Giuseppe Rotondi [Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1958])

2. Ostendentur vobis exigua sepulcra [→] ... iuvatque magnanimum et precedentiibus etiam et sequentibus se conferre. (II, ii, 6–7; ed. Carraud, 238–240; cfr. ed. Rotondi, 62–63) = De meditatione mortis (78v–80r)
3. Illud aliud spectaculum horrendum sed efficacissimum ad salutem [→] ... nisi misericordiam invenerit habitaculo sit recepta? (II, ii, 8; ed. Carraud, 241; cfr. ed. Rotondi, 63) = De meditatione mortis (80r)
4. Equidem imperator Hadrianus curiosissimus literarum [→] ... quam conniventibus oculis expectare dum feriat. II, ii, 9–10; ed. Carraud, 242–244; cfr. ed. Rotondi, 63–64) = De meditatione mortis (80r–81r)
5. An forte eius ineffabilis et infinita clementia non satis omnibus in se sperantibus nota est? (II, iv, 23; ed. Carraud, 284; cfr. ed. Rotondi, 76) = De secunda virtute theologica que est spes (19r–v)
6. Iam enim ad hodiernae disputationis alteram partem [→] ... animam miseram imbecillem mole sua premit et suffocat. (II, iii, 1; ed. Carraud, 246; cfr. ed. Rotondi, 64–65) = De castitate (35r)

ss; I will not back down to the SDS." The story was passed down by word of mouth; its first written account appears in John Monfasani, "The Many Lives of Paul Oskar Kristeller," in *Living Legacies at Columbia*, ed. W. Theodore De Bary, with Jerry Kisslinger and Tom Matthewson (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 114.

- 101 I have provided the beginnings and endings of the Petrarch quotations for easy retrieval, and I have added the title of corresponding chapter and the folio numbers from Andreas Pannonius's works.

7. Libet inserere unum his consentaneum gentilis sed sapientissimi viri dictum [→]... libelli huius brevis non capit. (11, iv, 4; ed. Carraud, 261; cfr. ed. Rotondi, 68–69) = De castitate (35r–v)
8. En fragilitas nostra ante oculos nostros semper [→]... nimis magna et nimis nota res visa est. (1, xii, 2; ed. Carraud, 158–160; cfr. ed. Rotondi, 38) = De meditatione regis (75r)

Epystole Seniles

Sen., IV, 1.

(“De officio et virtutibus imperatoris liber ad Luchinum Vermium Veronensem”, in Francisci Petrarchae *Opera quae extant omnia* [Basel: Sebastian Henricpetri, 1581] 386–392.)

9. Non enim loquor ut vel te doceam vel me ostentem [→]... ipsa cuius profiteris patrocinium iustitia, quique illam non deserit coelesti favor... (ed. 386–387) = [Prooemium] (1r–2r)
10. Magnam mihi preterea spem tribuit spectata in dubiis virtus tua [→]... tu tibi Deum ducem, coelestesque angelos vexilliferos elige... (ed. 387) = De bellis (46r–v)
11. Ceterum ne intentum rebus animum verbis non necessariis et exhortationibus occupem [→]... vel relectio fecerit vel auditus (ed. 387) = Quare Christiani traduntur in manibus paganorum? (54r–v)
12. Ad id venio quod ex me qui magna nequeo [→]... nullo unquam studio quaeri possunt (ed. 387) = Quare Christiani traduntur in manibus paganorum? (54v–55r)
13. Prima dos igitur summi ducis est scientia rei militaris [→]... certissimi sunt historiarum Romanarum autores (ed. 387–388) = De dotibus summi ducis bellorum (55r–v)
14. Est et altior militaris disciplina [→]... iidem et litteratissimi fuere. (ed. 388) = De dotibus summi ducis bellorum (55v–56v)
15. Neque tamen sic intelligar ut philosophiam et poesim [→]... nisi ea iugis lectio et tribuat et conservet. (ed. 388) = De dotibus summi ducis bellorum (56v)
16. Vere propria Pompeji Magni laus est [→]... apud externos Alexander primum locum tenet, ut Greci volunt, neque nostri obstant. (ed. 390) = De mansuetudine et clementia (60r)
17. Quarta mihi nunc superest modestia, quam temperantiam vocant [→]... in qua si imitari illum collega eius Crassus voluisset, numquam ipse cum filio et cum tanta ruina imperii cecidisset. (ed. 390) = Ibid. (58r–v)

Sen., IV, 2.

(“Luchino Veremio”, in Petrarchae *Opera*, cit., 781)

18. Salve igitur Metelle Cretice, seu tu noster Scipio Veronensis [→]... tu patriae pacem, et perdita regna restituis. = De beatitudine sanctorum (106v)

Sen., VII, 1.

(“Urbano V. Pont. Max. ut Romam Ecclesiae sedem repetat, hortatur”, in Petrarchae *Opera*, cit., 827)

19. Cristus omnipotens [→]... sed sanis ac fidelibus. = De beatitudine sanctorum (106v)

Sen., IX, 1.

(“Urbano papae V. gratulatio producta in suas sedes ecclesia: et exhortatio ad perseverantiam”, in Petrarchae *Opera*, cit., 844–854)

20. Orbem nostrum serenasti [→]... benignum sydus aliquod mundo dedit... (c. 1; ed. 844) = De veris laudibus reverendissimi domini domini Johannis archiepiscopis Strigoniensis (71r)
21. In exitu Israel de Aegypto [→]... benignum sydus aliquod mundo dedit... (c. 1; ed. 844) = De beatitudine sanctorum (106v)

Sen., XI, II.

(“Lombardo de Serico vitam quam degimus describit”, in Petrarchae *Opera*, id. ed., 703–704)

22. Videtur mihi vita haec quaedam area laborum [→]... superba miseria, miseranda felicitas. = De meditatione regis (74r–75r)

Sen., XIV, 1.

(“Ad Magnificum Franciscum de Carraria Padue dominum, qualis esse debeat qui rem publicam regit”, in *Epistole di Francesco Petrarca*, a cura di Ugo Dotti [Torino: Nino Aragno, 1978], 760–836)

23. Dudum tibi, vir clarissime, scriberem [→]... virtutem laudum stimulis excitans, quibus nichil generosum animum urgere potentius. (c. 2; ed. 764–766) = [Prooemium] (4r–v)
24. Que cum ita sint, labor, ut video, michi nunc historie longioris eripitur [→]... uno ex actu laudem geminam et fortitudinis et prudentie consecutus. (c. 5; ed. 766–768) = [Prooemium] (4r–6r)

25. Caritate, enim, inquit Cicero [→] . . . non armis (c. 13; ed. 780) = Sequitur de tertia virtute theologica que est karitas (24r)

Sen., XVI, 9.

(“Ioanni priori magnae carthusiae excusatio quod viventem laudaverit”, in Petrarcae *Opera*, cit., 961)

26. Veras enim laudes inter blandimenta non numero [→] . . . laudataque virtus crescit, ut eleganter ait Naso. = De beatitudine sanctorum (106r–v)

Sen., XVII, 4.

(“Ad eundem [Bocacium] dereliquiis superioris epistule et de imponendo iam tandem finem huic epistolari stilo”, in Francesco Petrarca, *Griselda*, a cura di Luca Carlo Rossi [Palermo: Sellerio, 1991] 77)

27. Legit eam primum communis amicus Patavinus, vir altissimi ingenii multiplicisque notitie, et, cum epistole medium vix transisset, subito fletu preventus substiti. = De veris laudibus reverendissimi domini domini Johannis archiepiscopis Strigoniensis (71r)

2 *Quotations from Petrarch in Andreas Pannonius’ Ad Herculem*¹⁰²

De Viris Illustribus

(Petrarca, *De viris illustribus*, ed. Martellotti, cit.)

1. Hanibalem tot ducum exercituumque victorem [→] . . . penitusque se victum ingenue fateretur. (“De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano” [β], 1, 5; ed. 158) = De virtutibus bellicis et rebus preclarissime gestis magnanimi ducis domini Herculis: capitulum xxvii (49v–50r)
2. . . . atque in primis mos ille percelebris, ex quo virilem primum togam induit nunquam dum Rome esset intermissus [→] . . . ad agendas res spei plenus atque alacer procedebat (“De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano” [β], 1, 6; ed. 158) = Quod non oportet fidere propriis viribus principem: capitulum xxii (41v)
3. Primum opus bellicum Carthago Hispana, urbs prevalida ac munita [→] . . . tantis se se imparem fassus honoribus, deosque in premium delegans (“De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano” [β], 11, 1–6 *passim*; ed. 161–164) = Quod non oportet fidere propriis viribus principem: capitulum xxii (43r–v)
4. *Ipse vero legionibus et classibus exercendis [→] . . . qua concussa erant reliquum tempus egit. (“De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano” [β], 11, 8; ed. 164) = De prima virtute summi ducis: capitulum xxiv (46r)

¹⁰² If an item comes up in *De regis virtutibus* as well, it is preceded by *.

5. Promotis utrinque nunc etiam castris [→] ... ad studium pacis inclinare animum possent. [...] Ad quem Romani ducis responsum acrius fuit... ("De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano" [β], 1x, 15–18, 23; ed. 254–255, 257) = De magnanimitate: capitulum xxv (47v–48r)
6. Ubi sequens illuxit dies in campum acies hinc inde descensum est [→] ... maxime moture animos crederentur. ("De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano" [β], x, 1–8; ed. 260–262) = De virtutibus bellicis et rebus preclarissime gestis magnanimi ducis domini Herculis: capitulum xxvii (50v–51r)
7. Duces ambo, undique circumvecti [→] ... nichil penitus supremi temporis perdere ... ("De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano" [β], x, 9; ed. 262) = De virtutibus bellicis et rebus preclarissime gestis magnanimi ducis domini Herculis: capitulum xxvii (51r)
8. Alexander Macedo, preclarum in regibus nomen habens [→] ... multa potius et magna quam fortia. ("De Alexandro Macedone", 1; ed. 58) = De virtutibus bellicis et rebus preclarissime gestis magnanimi ducis domini Herculis: capitulum xxvii (49v)
9. Ego nec rem dignam censeo [→] ... se in viros, illum in feminas incidisse. ("De Alexandro Macedone", 51; ed. 70–71) = Exhortatio ad vindicandam iniuriam Christi Ihesu ab impurissimis Machumetanis illatam: capitulum xxxii (60v)
10. Hanibal, dux Carthaginensium, Hamilcaris filius [→] ... nullum ex omnibus infestiores hostem populus romanus habuerit. ("De Hanibale Carthaginensium duce", 1; ed. 78) = De virtutibus bellicis et rebus preclarissime gestis magnanimi ducis domini Herculis: capitulum xxvii (49v)

De Gestis Cesaris

(Francesco Petrarca, *De gestis Cesaris*, a cura di Giuliana Crevatin [Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 2003], Testi e saggi rinascimentali, 2)

11. Adolescens haud sane dives fuit [→] ... futurus regum dominus ac regnorum ... (ed. 1) = De virtutibus bellicis et rebus preclarissime gestis magnanimi ducis domini Herculis: capitulum xxvii (50r)

Contra Medicum Quendam

(Pétrarque, *Invectives*, texte traduit, présenté et annoté par Rebecca Lenoir [Grenoble: Jerome Millon, 2003], 44–249)

12. Hanibal, vir bellicosissimus, bello victus a Romanis [→] ... precepta de re militari dare? (1; ed. 70–72) = De dotibus summi ducis: capitulum xxiii (44v–45r)

De Secreto Conflictu Curarum Mearum

(Petrarchae *Opera*, cit., 337)

13. Dicam (quamvis iam vulgo persuasum sit atque etiam e medio philosophorum grege clarissimi testes accesserint) [→] . . . tenacior enim esse solet visorum quam auditorum recordatio. (lib. 1) = De memoria mortis: capitulum IX (93r–94v)

De Otio Religioso

Pétrarque, *De otio religioso*, ed. cit. Carraud; cfr. *Il “De otio religioso” di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. cit. Rotondi)

14. *Ostendentur vobis exigua sepulcra [→] . . . omnia tandem in nihilum abiere. (II, ii, 6–7; ed. Carraud, 238–240; cfr. ed. Rotondi, 62–63) = De memoria mortis: capitulum IX (94r–v)
15. Illud aliud spectaculum horrendum sed efficacissimum ad salutem [→] . . . nisi misericordiam invenerit habitaculo sit recepta? (II, ii, 8; ed. Carraud, 241; cfr. ed. Rotondi, 63) = De memoria mortis: capitulum IX (95r)
16. “Mors”, enim, inquit, “terribilis est his quorum cum vita omnia extinguuntur, non his quorum laus emori non potest”. (II, viii, 6; ed. Carraud, 360; cfr. ed. Rotondi, 98) = Miraculum: capitulum XIII (101r–v)

Epystole Familiares

Fam., III, 10.

(“Ad amicum Transalpinum magnum quendam virum, mortem ignavia non differri et nichil turpe ideo faciendum ut diutius vivatur”; in Pétrarque, *Lettres familières – Rerum familiarum libri*, traduction de André Longpré, notices et notes de Ugo Dotti, 1, [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002])

17. Fides silentium interrumpit, caritas loqui cogit [→] . . . et tibi gloriam apud gentes. (1; ed. 277) = De genere bellorum: capitulum XXIX (54r)
18. . . nulla procul dubio tanta res ab avorum nostrorum temporibus [→] . . . Corporibus metuemus Austrum (c. 1–8; ed. 277–281) = Exhortatio ad vindicandam iniuriam Christi Ihesu ab impurissimis Machumetanis illatam: capitulum XXXII (59r–60r)

Fam. III, 12.

(“Ad Marcum Ianuensem, posse etiam qui reipublice student innocenter et pie vivere, posse et ex eo strepitu ad altioris vite silentium aspirare”, in Pétrarque, *Lettres familières*, cit., 1)

19. Novit figmentum nostrum figulus ille sidereus [→]... non “purgatorii” modo “purgatique” iam “animi”, sed “politicis” quoque “virtutibus” beatum fieri. (c. 4–8; ed. 291–293) = Exhortatio ad virtutes: capitulum quartum (9r)
20. Notum est apud Ciceronem celeste illud [→]... que civitates appellantur (c. 6; ed. 291) = Miraculum: capitulum XIII (101v)

Fam., IV, 13.

Fam., IV, 13. (“Ad Lelium, de eadem morte non consolatio sed querela”; [sc. de morte Iacobi Columnae, cfr. *Fam.*, IV, 12]; ed. Pétrarque, *Lettres familières*, cit., II, Paris, 2002)

21. ... moriendum fuerat, antequam preriperet nobis Deus [→]... nec invenio quid tantis virtutibus dignum loquar. (c. 1–2; ed. 89) = Quomodo corpora damnatorum ab igne infernali non consumantur: capitulum duodecesimum (998v–999r)

Fam., V, 15.

(“Ad eundem [Socratem suum] exhortatoria”, in Pétrarque, *Lettres familières*, II, cit.)

22. In Campum Martium omnes qui nascimur vocati sumus; quidam tamen non nisi ad strepitum numerumque complendum, quidam vero ut honores et laborum premia percipiant. (c. 1; ed. 201; cfr. *Epistole di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. cit. Dotti, 176) = Exhortatio ad virtutes: capitulum quartum (9r)

Fam., VII, 12.

(“Ad Iohannem Anchiseum de expectati amici morte conquestio”, in Pétrarque, *Lettres familières*, II, cit.)

23. Heu, quid hoc est? quid audio? [→]... spondere nobis iocundum aliquid audeamus? (c. 1; ed. 375 = Lamentatio lugubris: capitulum primum (81v)

Fam., VII, 15

(“Ad Luchinum Vicecomitem, Mediolani dominum, de principibus literatis”, in Pétrarque, *Lettres familières*, cit., II)

24. Etsi fortasse animum altissimis intentum curis ista non tangant [→]... ad Pyerii modulaminis dulcedinem transtulisse. (c. 3; ed. 399) = De prudentia: capitulum XIII (28v)

Fam., VIII, 7.

(“Ad Socratem suum, flebiliter de peste illa sine exemplo, que in eorum incidit etatem”, in Pétrarque, *Lettres familières*, cit., III, Paris, 2003)

25. Mi frater, mi frater, mi frater [→] ... undique dolor, terror undique. (c. 1; ed. 77) = Lamentatio lugubris: capitulum primum (81v)

Fam., X, 1.

(“Ad Carolum Quartum Romanorum regem, exhortatio ad transitum in Italiam”, in Pétrarque, *Lettres familières*, cit., III, Paris, 2003)

26. Si virtutis amicus es, si glorie studiosus [→] ... profecto autem ex omnibus optimis ac sanctissimis curis tuis nulla gravior ... (c. 11–13; ed. 241–243) = Exhortatio ad vindicandam iniuriam Christi Ihesu ab impurissimis Machumetanis illatam: capitulum xxxii (60r–v)
27. Alexander Macedo ea etate qua nunc es, Oriente pererrato Indorum regna pulsabat [→] ... duce te libertatem perditam reposcentes. (c. 21–23; ed. 245–247) = Exhortatio ad vindicandam iniuriam Christi Ihesu ab impurissimis Machumetanis illatam: capitulum xxxii (61r)

Fam., XIII, 12.

(“Ad abbatem Corvarie Bononiensis, sitim operum novorum expectatione ac modestia temperandam”, in Pétrarque, *Lettres familières*, cit., IV, Paris, 2004)

28. ... sed nulla tanti viri virtus nulla telluris tanta fertilitas [→] ... animi fructum cupit. (c. 7; ed. 197) = Exhortatio ad virtutes: capitulum quartum (9r)

Fam., XIV, 1.

(“Ad Talarandum Albanensem episcopum cardinalem, de altioris vite difficultatibus atque periculis”, in Pétrarque, *Lettres familières*, cit., IV)

29. Solebant romani senatus alta consilia, profundo tecta silentio [→] ... et quod est vanius, multa que nunquam fient. (c. 12; ed. 211) = De laude clarissime domus Estensis: capitulum xxxvi (67r)

Fam., XIV, 5.

(“Duci et Consilio Ianuensium, exhortatio ad pacem cum Venetis et concordiam civilem”, in Pétrarque, *Lettres familières*, cit., IV)

30. Quid enim inter nos qui legimus [→] ... lacrimis aequare labores? (c. 7–9; ed. 294) = De virtutibus bellicis et rebus preclarissime gestis magnanimi ducis domini Herculis: capitulum xxvii (51r–v)

Fam., xv, 7.

(“Ad Stephanum de Columna prepositum Sancti Adomari, de inquieto totius pene orbis statu”, in Pétrarque, *Lettres familières*, cit., iv)

31. Ortus ac sepulcrum Domini [→] ... mors huic ignominie preferenda esset? (c. 15; ed. 333) = De desolatione Christianorum: capitulum xxxiii (62r)

Fam., xvi, 13

(“Ad eundem, nil ab homine fieri posse quod non reprehendatur”, in Francisci Petrarcae *Epistolae de rebus familiaribus et variae*, studio et cura Iosephi Fracassetti, II, [Florence: Le Monnier, 1862])

32. Quicquam ne mortalium in rebus tanto consilio [→] ... si immunes verberum, verbis impetitur. (c. 1; ed. 403) = Quartus ordo beatorum: capitulum xvii (105r-v)

Fam., xx, 4.

(“Marco Genuensi de studio legum et rerum forensium experientia”, in Francisci Petrarcae *Epistolae de rebus familiaribus et variae*, studio et cura Iosephi Fracassetti, III [Florence: Le Monnier, 1863])

33. Alioquin omnes homines unum studium haberent [→] ... non legibus magis quam natura valebat (c. 5; ed. 14-15) = Exhortatio ad virtutes: capitulum quartum (9r)

Fam., xxii, 12.

(“Ad Albertinum de Canobio physicum de necessitate moriendi”, in Petrarcae *Epistolae de rebus familiaribus*, cit., III)

34. ... quot sunt alia, quam diversa mortis spicula [→] ... illi Grecorum regi Troieque victori atque eversori tanto prius acciderat. (c. 15-17; ed. 155) = De genere et ordine mortis: capitulum viii (92r-v)
35. Sed dum cesset culpe virus, conscientie vulnus [→] ... quid de locis atque temporibus angimur? (c. 20-22; ed. 156-157) = De genere et ordine mortis: capitulum viii (92v-93r)

Fam., xxii, 14.

(“Ad Petrum Pictavensem, priorem Sancti Eligii Parisiensis, de mutatione fortunae”, in Petrarcae *Epistolae de rebus familiaribus*, cit., III)

36. Prima quidem victrix exercituum atque enervatrix virium voluptas [→] ... in qua principem non sequi militibus indecorum esset. (c. 11–21; ed. 164–166) = Quod non oportet fidere propriis viribus principem: capitulum XXII (42r–43r)
37. Et hec nimirum illa est a minus bono [→] ... immortales titulos celso fixerit trophæo. (c. 12; ed. 164) = De auxilio clarissimi senatus dominorum inclite urbis Venetiarum: capitulum XXXV (66r)
38. “Vini parcissimum” Iulium Cesarem hostium quoque confessione didicerant [→] ... extimatione tantorum fingi poterat (c. 22–24; ed. 166–167) = Quod non oportet fidere propriis viribus principem: capitulum XXII (43v–44r)
39. ... quod non fecit Cassius, de quo ita scribitur [→] ... ne vestigium quidem cuiquam pacato nocuisse dicatur. (c. 52–54; ed. 174) = Quod non oportet fidere propriis viribus principem: capitulum XXII (44r)

Fam., XXIII, 11.

(“Ad Iohannem Pergamensem causidicum, transfretantem gratia percipiende militie ad sepulcrum Cristi, dehortatio a tali proposito”, in Petrarcae *Epistolae de rebus familiaribus*, cit., 111)

40. Ceterum tu utlibet; ego, ut ne amico consilio res egeret prestiti [→] ... ante alios dignum qui Cristi iniurias vindicaret! (c. 6–8; ed. 213) = De coadiutoribus: capitulum XXXIV (63r–v)

Fam., XXIV, 12.

(“Responsio ad epystolam magnam multaque continentem sub Homeri poete missam nomine et apud Inferos datam”, in Petrarcae *Epistolae de rebus familiaribus*, cit., 111)

41. Sunt primitie virtutis [→] ... nocturne illum fugiunt aves (c. 28; ed. 300) = Quartus ordo beatorum: capitulum XVII (105r)

Epystole Seniles

Sen., IV, 1.

(“De officio et virtutibus imperatoriis liber ad Luchinum Vermium Veronensem”, in Petrarchae *Opera*, cit., 386–392)

42. Non vereor ne me irrideas ut Hannibal Phormionem. (ed. 386–387) = De dotibus summi ducis: capitulum XXIII (44r)
43. *Ceterum ne intentum rebus animum verbis non necessariis et exhortationibus occupem [→] ... quibus abundantem vel relectio fecerit vel auditus. (ed. 387) = De dotibus summi ducis: capitulum XXIII (45r)
44. *Ad id venio quod ex me qui magna nequeo [→] ... nullo unquam studio queri possunt. (ed. 387) = De dotibus summi ducis: capitulum XXIII (45r–v)

45. *Prima dos igitur summi ducis est scientia rei militaris [→]...certissimi sunt historiarum Romanarum autores (ed. 387–388) = De dotibus summi ducis bellorum (55r–v)
46. *Est et altior militaris disciplina [→]...sane autem excellentissimi quique ducum, iidem et litteratissimi fuere. (ed. 388) = De dotibus summi ducis bellorum (55v–56v)
47. *Neque tamen sic intelligat ut philosophiam et poesim [→]...nisi ea iugis lectio et tribuat et conservet. De dotibus summi ducis bellorum (56v)
48. Vere propria Pompeji Magni laus est [→]...apud externos Alexander primum locum tenet, ut Greci volunt, neque nostri obstant. (ed. 390) = De bellicis virtutibus, quibus omnis inimicorum fortitudo superatur: capitulum xxx (57r)

Sen., XIV, 1

(“Ad Magnificum Franciscum de Carraria Padue dominum, qualis esse debeat qui rem publicam regit”, in *Epistole di Francesco Petrarca*, a cura di Ugo Dotti [Turin: UTET, 1978], 760–836)

49. *Que cum ita sint, labor, ut video, michi nunc historie longioris eripitur [→]...uno ex actu laudem geminam et fortitudinis et prudentie consecutus. (c. 5; 766–768) = De origine clarissime illustrissimeque domus Estensis: capitulum primum (3v–4r)
50. *“Caritate” enim, inquit Cicero [→]...non armis”. (c. 13; ed. 780) = De caritate: capitulum undecimum (24r)

Sen., XVI, 9

(“Ioanni priori magnae carthusiae excusatio quod viventem laudaverit”, in *Petrarchae Opera*, cit., 961)

51. Veras enim laudes inter blandimenta non numero [→]...laudataque virtus crescit, ut eleganter ait Naso. = Prefatio (iv–2r)

Appendix B

Quotations from Petrarch in Andreas Pannonius’ De regis virtutibus

[Prooemium]	<i>Sen.</i> , IV, 1
	<i>Sen.</i> , XIV, 1 (2)
De secunda virtute theologica que est spes	<i>De otio religioso</i> , II, iv, 13
Sequitur de tertia virtute theologica que est karitas	<i>Sen.</i> , XIV, 1, 13

De castitate	<i>De otio religioso</i> , II, iii, 1 <i>De otio religioso</i> , II, iv, 4
De bellis	<i>Sen.</i> , IV, 1
Quare Christiani traduntur in manibus paganorum?	<i>Sen.</i> , IV, 1
De dotibus summi ducis bellorum	“De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano” [β], II, 8 <i>Sen.</i> , IV, 1
De mansuetudine et clementia	<i>Sen.</i> , IV, 1
De veris laudibus reverendissimi domini domini Johannis archiepiscopis Strigoniensis	<i>Sen.</i> , IX, 1 (1) <i>Sen.</i> , XVII, 4.
De meditatione regis	<i>De otio religioso</i> , I, xii, 2 <i>Sen.</i> , XI, 11
De meditatione mortis	<i>De otio religioso</i> , II, ii, 6–7 <i>De otio religioso</i> , II, ii, 8 <i>De otio religioso</i> , II, ii, 9–10
De beatitudine sanctorum	<i>Sen.</i> , IV, 2 <i>Sen.</i> , VII, 1 <i>Sen.</i> , IX, 1 (1) <i>Sen.</i> , XVI, 9

Quotations from Petrarch in Andreas Pannonius' Ad Herculem, lib. I

Prefatio	<i>Sen.</i> , XVI, 9
De origine clarissime illustrissimeque domus Estensis: capitulum primum	<i>Sen.</i> , XIV, 1 (5)
Exhortatio ad virtutes: capitulum quartum	<i>Fam.</i> , III, 12 (4–8) <i>Fam.</i> , V, 15 (1) <i>Fam.</i> , XIII, 12 (7) <i>Fam.</i> , XX, 4 (5)
De caritate: capitulum XI	<i>Sen.</i> , XIV, 1 (13)
De prudentia: capitulum XIII	<i>Fam.</i> , VII, 15 (3)
Quod non oportet fidere propriis viribus principem: capitulum XXII	“De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano” [β], II, 1–6 <i>Fam.</i> , XXII, 14 (11–21) <i>Fam.</i> , XXII, 14 (22–24) <i>Fam.</i> , XXII, 14 (52–54)
De dotibus summi ducis: capitulum XXIII	<i>Contra medicum quendam</i> , I <i>Sen.</i> , IV, 1

De prima virtute summi ducis: capitulum XXIV	"De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano" [β], II, 8
De magnanimitate: capitulum XXV	"De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano" [β], IX, 15–18
De virtutibus bellicis et rebus preclarissime gestis magnanimi ducis domini Herculis: capitulum XXVII	"De Publio Cornelio Scipione Africano" [β], I, 6; [β], X, 1–8; [β], X, 9 De Alexandro Macedone", 1 "De Hanibale Carthaginensium duce", 1 <i>De gestis Cesaris</i> , 1 <i>Fam.</i> , XIV, 5 (7–9) <i>Fam.</i> , III, 10 (1) <i>Sen.</i> , IV, 1
De genere bellorum: capitulum XXIX	
De bellicis virtutibus, quibus omnis inimicorum fortitudo superatur: capitulum XXX	
Exhortatio ad vindicandam iniuriam Christi Ihesu ab impurissimis Machumetanis illatam: capitulum XXXII	"De Alexandro Macedone", 51 <i>Fam.</i> , III, 10, 1–8 <i>Fam.</i> , X, 1 (11–13) <i>Fam.</i> , X, 1 (21–23) <i>Fam.</i> , XV, 7 (15)
De desolatione Christianorum: capitulum XXXIII	
De coadiutoribus: capitulum XXXIV	<i>Fam.</i> , XXIII, 11 (6–8)
De auxilio clarissimi senatus dominorum inclite urbis Venetiarum: capitulum XXXV	<i>Fam.</i> , XXII, 14 (12)
De laude clarissime domus Estensis: capitulum XXXVI	<i>Fam.</i> , XIV, 1 (12)

Quotations from Petrarch in Ad Herculem, lib. II

Lamentatio lugubris: capitulum I	<i>Fam.</i> , VII, 12 (1) <i>Fam.</i> , VIII, 7 (1)
De genere et ordine mortis: capitulum VIII	<i>Fam.</i> , XXII, 12 (15–17) <i>Fam.</i> , XXII, 12 (20–22)
De memoria mortis: capitulum IX	<i>De secreto conflictu curarum mearum</i> , 1 <i>De otio religioso</i> , II, ii, 6–7 <i>De otio religioso</i> , II, ii, 8
Quomodo corpora damnatorum ab igne infernali non consumantur: capitulum XII	<i>Fam.</i> , IV, 13 (1–2)
Miraculum: capitulum XIII	<i>De otio religioso</i> , II, viii, 6 <i>Fam.</i> , III, 12 (6)
Quartus ordo beatorum: capitulum XVII	<i>Fam.</i> , XVI, 13 (1) <i>Fam.</i> , XXIV, 12 (28)

Marsilio Ficino as a Reader of Proclus and Most Notably of Proclus' *In Parmenidem*

Michael J.B. Allen

To understand the depth of Ficino's encounter with Proclus' works and particularly with his *In Parmenidem*, we must begin with the Proclian works that had been rendered into Latin *ad litteram* in the thirteenth century by the Flemish Dominican, William of Moerbeke. In May 1268 Moerbeke finished rendering Proclus' *Elements of Theology*, which survives in at least 27 manuscripts and was the most widely diffused of his translations.¹ It was cited by Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, and others, and was the object of several commentaries. Ficino too cited this translation in one of his earliest writings, and made excerpts from the Greek text along with a new Latin translation of the work which is now lost.² In the twelfth century Nicolaus of Methone had written a *Refutatio* attacking the *Elements*, and in a manuscript of this *Refutatio* which Ficino owned (ms Paris BnF Gr. 1256), we have Ficino's brief notes on Proclus' first six propositions.³

Moerbeke also translated the three influential short treatises of Proclus on providence, fate, and the existence of evil, completing the task in Corinth in

* A longer version of this essay has now appeared in *Interpreting Proclus: From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, ed. Stephen Gersh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014). Both versions honor John Monfasani and his contributions to scholarship.

1 Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Proclus as a Reader of Plato and Plotinus, and His Influence in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance," in *Proclus: Lector et interprète des Anciens* (Paris: CNRS, 1987), 191–211 at 197–198. I am much indebted throughout to this masterly article with its host of detailed references. It is reprinted in Kristeller's *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, IV (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1996), 115–137. I shall refer to the original pagination.

2 Ibid. 198.

3 Martin Sichterl, "Zwei Autographen Marsilio Ficinós: Borg. Gr. 22 und Par. Gr. 1256," in *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone: Studi e documenti*, ed. Giancarlo Garfagnini, 2 vols. (Florence: Olschki, 1986), I: 221–228 at 226–227. See also Christian Förstel, "Marsilio Ficino e il Parigino greco 1816 di Plotino," in *Marsilio Ficino: Fonti, Testi, Fortuna*, ed. Sebastiano Gentile and Stéphane Toussaint (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2006), 65–88 at 82–83.

February 1280.⁴ These survive in at least thirteen manuscripts; and the Greek original, long considered lost, has been partially excavated from an attack on Proclus compiled by Isaac Sebastocrator.⁵ Ficino made explicit references to these treatises in his commentary on the Areopagite's great work, *On the Divine Names*, a work which we now realise was indebted to the treatises and not vice versa.

Moerbeke's Latin rendering of Proclus' *In Timaeum* appears to be fragmentary and exists in only two manuscripts; whether he translated more than the surviving excerpts is unknown. Kristeller suggests that the work remained eclipsed by the continuing impact of Calcidius' Middle Platonic *In Timaeum*, widely consulted and repeatedly copied in the Middle Ages and printed several times in the 16th century.⁶ Nonetheless, the Greek text of Proclus' *In Timaeum* also circulated in the Renaissance, and we still have copies owned by Bessarion and Ficino and excerpts by Patrizi. Ficino had access in fact to two manuscript copies: the one he owned is partial in that it is missing the second half of the third book, the other, only recently identified, is complete.⁷ Gentile's recent edition of the second book of Ficino's letters has a number of references to Proclus' *In Timaeum*⁸ and this suggests an indebtedness that needs further exploration in other Ficino texts, including of course Ficino's own *In Timaeum*. Interestingly, Pico quoted extensively from Proclus' *In Timaeum* in the *Conclusiones* he attributed to Porphyry and Iamblichus, and he was clearly using the commentary as a doxographical resource.⁹

The last of Moerbeke's Proclus translations was that of the massive *In Parmenidem* which comments on everything in Plato's dialogue up to the

4 Procli *Diadochi tria opuscula (De providentia, libertate, malo) latine Guillelmo de Moerbeka vertente et Graece ex Isaacii Sebastocratoris aliorumque scriptis collecta*, ed. Helmut Boese (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1960).

5 Kristeller, "Proclus as a Reader," 199.

6 Ibid.

7 Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, MS 24 and Vatican City, BAV, MS Chigiana R VIII 58 respectively. See Paula Megna, "Marsilio Ficino e il Commento di Proclo al *Timaeo*," *Studi medioevali e umanistici* 1 (2003): 93–135; eadem, "Per Ficino e Proclo," in *Laurentia laurus: per Mario Martelli*, ed. Francesco Bausi e Vincenzo Fera (Messina: Centro di studi umanistici, 2004), 313–362. See also Sebastiano Gentile's entry no. 85 in *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone: Mostra di manoscritti, stampe e documenti 17 maggio – 16 giugno 1984*, ed. Sebastiano Gentile, Sandra Niccoli and Paolo Viti (Florence: Le Lettere, 1984), 25–26 – hereafter *Mostra*.

8 Ed. Sebastiano Gentile, *Marsilio Ficino: Lettere II* (Florence: Olschki, 2010), 171–172.

9 Kristeller, "Proclus as a Reader," 199–200.

end of the first hypothesis at 142A8.¹⁰ Two features are of special note. First, Moerbeke's translation of the commentary includes his translation of lemmata from the text of the *Parmenides*, and these provide us with an important addition to the small list of Platonic dialogues accessible in Latin, in whole or in part, to the medieval West. Second, Moerbeke's rendering preserves the last portion of Proclus' commentary – that on 141E7–142A8 – which is lost in the original Greek.¹¹ It survives in at least six manuscripts, one of them owned by Cusanus who annotated it,¹² and who subsequently ordered the Greek émigré George of Trebizond (1394–ca 1472) to make another translation of the dialogue which was completed in 1459.¹³ A decade later, the Greek Bessarion (ca. 1403–1472) used the Neoplatonic interpretation of the *Parmenides* to convince his Italian audience that Plato was superior to Aristotle and closer to Christianity.¹⁴

- 10 See Carlos Steel, "La place du Vat. Lat. 11600 dans la tradition de la traduction latine du commentaire *In Parmenidem* de Proclus," *Scriptorium* 31 (1977): 262–266; and Steel's two-volume edition of Moerbeke's commentary, *Proclus: Commentaire sur le Parménide de Platon, traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke* (Louvain-Leiden: Louvain University Press, 1982 and 1985). See also the pioneering work of Raymond Klibansky and Carlotta Labowsky, *Parmenides usque ad finem primae hypothesis... interprete Guillelmo de Moerbeka* (London: Warburg Institute, 1953). For the diffusion of Moerbeke's translation, see Loris Sturlese, "Il dibattito sul Proclo latino nel Medioevo fra l'Università di Parigi e lo Studium di Colonia," in *Proclus et son influence: Actes du colloque de Neuchâtel, juin 1985*, ed. Gilbert Boss & Gerhard Seel (Zurich: GMB Editions du Grand Midi, 1987), 261–285.
- 11 This final part is now reprinted, together with a modern retroversion into Greek, in Steel's magisterial *Procli In Platonis Parmenidem Commentaria*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Press Clarendon, 2007–2009), III: 279–355. See also the competing edition, *Proclus: Commentaire sur le Parménide de Platon*, ed. and tr. Concetta Luna & Alain Philippe Segonds, 3 vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2007–2011). Scholarship hitherto has been indebted to the 1864 edition by Cousin (see n. 51 *infra*).
- 12 Ibid. II: 529–557 (with Cusanus' annotations).
- 13 See John Monfasani, *Collectanea Trapezuntiana: Texts, documents and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond* (Binghamton NY: MRTS, 1984), 167–170; id., "Nicholas of Cusa, the Byzantines, and the Greek Language," now in his Variorum volume *Greeks and Latins in Renaissance Italy* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004) as item VIII – at 221 Monfasani deals with Bessarion's notes on George's translation of the *Parmenides*. These are in a unique codex (Volterra, Biblioteca Comunale Guarnacciana, MS 6201) which also contains the notes of George's son Andreas Trapezuntius and those of Cusanus.
- 14 For the *Parmenides* and Nicholas of Cusa, George of Trebizond, and Bessarion, in addition to Monfasani's work cited above, see Raymond Klibansky, "Plato's *Parmenides* in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance," in *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* I, part 2, ed. Richard Hunt & Raymond Klibansky (London: Warburg Institute, 1943), 24–30; and Ilario Ruocco, *Il Platone Latino. Il Parmenide: Giorgio di Trebisonda e il cardinale Cusano* (Florence: Olschki, 2003).

Ficino certainly drew on Proclus' *In Parmenidem* in composing his own long commentary,¹⁵ and he did so using Moerbeke's rendering of Proclus. Indeed, Carlos Steel, the authority on Moerbeke, has just argued persuasively for Ficino's extensive use of the Dominican's version.¹⁶ We shall address the issue of Ficino's quasi-Proclian interpretation of the dialogue below.

To Moerbeke's Latin Corpus of Proclus' writings, the fifteenth century added the huge *Platonic Theology*, arguably Proclus' *magnum opus*. The translation was begun by Ambrogio Traversari at the behest of Cusanus, and a specimen translation of two chapters of Book I made just before Traversari died in 1439 survives in a copy penned by Cusanus himself.¹⁷ A complete translation, again at the behest of Cusanus, was undertaken by a longtime member of Bessarion's household, Petrus Balbus Pisanus, from 1463 the bishop of Tropea in southern Italy.¹⁸ Balbi completed this on 26 March 1462 before Cusanus' death in 1464 and dedicated it to King Ferrante of Naples. Of the three extant manuscripts, two belonged to the Cardinal and the third went to Ferrante with a preface declaring that Balbi had translated the work at Cusanus' request.¹⁹

-
- 15 Two editions of this Ficinian commentary have just appeared simultaneously: *Marsilio Ficino, Commento al 'Parmenide' di Platone*, ed. and tr. Francesca Lazzarin, *Immagini della Ragione* 15 (Florence: Olschki, 2012); and *Marsilio Ficino, Commentaries on Plato, Volume 2: Parmenides*, 2 vols., ed. and tr. Maude Vanhaelen, *The 1 Tatti Renaissance Library* 51–52 (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2012). See their respective introductions; also Lazzarin's "Note sull'interpretazione ficiniana del *Parmenide* di Platone," *Accademia* 5 (2003): 17–37.
- 16 Contrast Steel's circumspect remarks in the introduction to his edition, *Procli In Platonis Parmenidem Commentaria* 1: 38*–42*, with his more recent assertions in "Ficino and Proclus: Arguments for the Platonic Doctrine of the Ideas," in *The Rebirth of Platonic Theology*, ed. James Hankins and Fabrizio Meroi (Florence: Olschki, 2013), 63–118. Vanhaelen, by contrast, assumes that Ficino worked primarily from the Greek text except for the missing end portion. In 1521 the commentary was translated yet again by Scutellius (1490–1542).
- 17 Kristeller, "Proclus as a Reader," 201; Monfasani, "Nicholas of Cusa," 218.
- 18 See Alessandro Pratesi's entry in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* (Rome: Treccani, 1960–present), v: 378–379; Henri Dominique Saffrey, "Pietro Balbi et la première traduction latine de la *Théologie Platonicienne* de Proclus," in *Miscellanea codicologica F. Masai dicata*, ed. Pierre Cockshaw, Monique-Cécile Garand, & Pierre Jodogne, 2 vols. (Ghent/Gand: E. Story-Scientia S.P.R.L., 1979/80), 425–437; and John Monfasani, "Some Quattrocento Translators of St. Basil the Great: Gaspare Zacchi, Episcopus Anonymus, Pietro Balbi, Athanasius Chalkeopoulos, and Cardinal Bessarion," in *Philanagnostes: Studi in onore di Marino Zorzi*, ed. Chryssa Maltezou, Peter Schreiner, and Margherita Losacco (Venice: Istituto Ellenico di studi bizantini e postbizantini, 2008), 249–264 at 252 and n. 21.
- 19 Kristeller, "Proclus as a Reader," 201.

Ficino apparently knew of Balbi's translation.²⁰ He and Bessarion, Pico, Giles of Viterbo, Patrizi and Holstenius all had access to Greek manuscripts of the original²¹ and we actually have Ficino's marginalia on the Riccardiana's MS Gr. 70.²² Though Proclus' great work provided the Florentine with the title for his own *magnum opus* – whereas the sub-title "On the immortality of souls" invokes Plotinus and Augustine – nonetheless the two *Platonic Theologies* are quite different and I have not found that Ficino is much indebted to his predecessor's work, though Proclus' deployment of material from Plato's *Phaedrus* deserves perhaps a second look.²³ This is striking given that Proclus was – after Plato, Plotinus, and the Areopagite – the Platonic authority to whom Ficino was most indebted, even though he often concealed the debt or mentioned it only by way of disagreement. We might note that Patrizi later made extracts from the work and "the great fragment" (i.e. 1.11 to 2.4)²⁴ was re-translated by Scutellius in 1520. The Greek text was quoted extensively by Augustinus Steuchus in his *De perenni philosophia*; and it was finally published in 1618, with a new Latin translation, by Aemilius Portus, though the edition was criticized by Holstenius in his manuscript notes.²⁵

• • •

Ficino himself contributed four additions to the Latin Corpus of Proclus' works besides coming up with his own translations of Proclus' *Hymns*, of the *Elements of Theology*, and of the *Elements of Physics* (*De motu*), none of which has survived, unfortunately.²⁶

20 See Ficino's 1489 letter to Martin Prenninger (*Opera*, 899), where he lists the works of Proclus available in Latin: "Leguntur etiam utcumque traducta Elementa theologiae Proculi atque ipsius Theologia et liber de providentia simul atque fato."

21 Kristeller, "Proclus as a Reader," 201.

22 This contains Proclus's *Platonic Theology*, the *Elements of Theology* and the *Elements of Physics*, along with Ocellus Lucanus' *De natura universi*. See Henri Dominique Saffrey, "Notes platoniciennes de Marsile Ficin dans un manuscrit de Proclus," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et de Renaissance* 21 (1959): 161–184, with an edition of Ficino's annotations on 168–179. Saffrey argues that Ficino would not have known this manuscript until 1492, while Sebastiano Gentile's entry 26 in *Mostra* argues that Ficino had read and annotated it before 1463.

23 See my *The Platonism of Marsilio Ficino* (Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984), 249–254.

24 Ed. Saffrey & Westerink, 1: 54.26 (*Hoi gar peri tôn theiôn*) to 2: 31.4 (*gegonenai kataphanes*).

25 Kristeller, "Proclus as a Reader," 201–202.

26 See Kristeller's *Supplementum Ficinianum*, 2 vols. (Florence: Olschki, 1937), 1: cxlv; id., "Proclus as a Reader" 197–198. There are several anonymous translations of Proclus's

In 1488–89 he translated a short text he entitled *De sacrificio et magia* (*Opera*, pp. 1928–1929); and made some substantial selections from Proclus' commentary on Plato's *First Alcibiades* (*Opera*, pp. 1908–1928).²⁷ Both these translations were widely diffused, accompanying as they did Ficino's translation of Iamblichus' *De mysteriis* and of other Neoplatonic works in a volume published by Aldus Manutius in 1497 and often reprinted.²⁸ As to the *De sacrificio*, it was long deemed to be a rendering of a lost Greek original (and Kroll even reconstructed the Greek from the Latin); but the Greek text has been rediscovered in two manuscripts used and owned by Ficino. Kristeller has supposed it was probably an excerpt made not by Proclus but by Psellus from a longer work now lost.²⁹ The *De sacrificio* seems to have influenced Ficino's *De Vita* book III and thereby played a seminal role in Renaissance theories of natural and demonic magic.³⁰

In mid 1492 Ficino came upon the first half of a codex containing Proclus' huge *In Rempublicam*. The codex was originally four hundred leaves or more and dated from the ninth or tenth century. But it was later divided and owned by Armonios or Harmonios of Athens, the nephew of Theodore Gaza.³¹ The first half – now the first volume in the standard two volume edition by Wilhelm Kroll – contained dissertations I–XII on the first seven books of the *Republic*; and it was in excellent condition when it was bought by Janus Lascaris in 1492

Hymns, however, from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, including one now attributed to Janus Lascaris. This is found in Florence Biblioteca Laurenziana MS 36.35, fols. 23v–25v, alongside translations of the Orphic *Hymns* and the *Chaldaean Oracles* that have been also attributed to Lascaris. See Sebastiano Gentile's entry no. 20 in *Mostra*.

- 27 See Kristeller, *Supplementum* 1: cxxxiv–cxxxv; and Paola Megna, "Per Ficino e Proclo," 313–362, who has identified Ficino's exemplar as Vatican City, BAV, MS Palat. gr. 63.
- 28 Kristeller, "Proclus as a Reader," 202–203. The standard edition of Proclus's *In Alcibiadem Primum* is by Alain Philippe Segonds, 2 vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1985–1986).
- 29 Ibid., citing "Proclus sur l'art hiératique," ed. Joseph Bidez in *Catalogue des Manuscrits Alchimiques Grecs*, vol. VI (Brussels: Lamertin, 1928), 137–151.
- 30 See the foundational work of Brian P. Copenhaver, "Astrology and Magic," in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. Schmitt, Quentin Skinner, Eckhard Kessler, and Jill Kraye (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 264–300 at 279; and, in a fuller treatment, "Hermes Trismegistus, Proclus, and the Question of a Theory of Magic in the Renaissance," in *Hermeticism and the Renaissance: Intellectual History and the Occult in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Ingrid Merkel and Allen G. Debus (London & Washington D.C.: Associated Universities Press, 1988), 79–110.
- 31 See Maria Papanicolaou, "Harmonios ho Athenaios: Bibliofilo e copista, maestro di greco e diplomatico," in *Studi in onore di Mgr. Paul Canart per il LXX compleanno*, vol. 2. *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata*, n.s. 52 (1998): 283–301.

for the Medici library in Florence. It is now the Laurenziana's MS 80.9.³² Ficino must have borrowed the new acquisition almost immediately, for we have a note of July 7th to that effect.³³ In less than a month, he had translated some extracts, "plucking flowers from its delightful meadows," which he then sent in a letter to Martinus Uranius (Prenninger) dated August 3rd 1492. This letter he incorporated into the eleventh book of his *Letters* (published in 1495 and thereafter repeatedly reprinted).³⁴

The second half of the codex, the half containing dissertations XIII–XVII, has a different story. This did not come to the West until many years later, certainly long after Ficino's death in 1499. It was first owned by the Salviati, whom Holstenius blamed in 1640 for its bad condition, before passing into the hands of the Colonna family and thence in 1821 to the Vatican where it is now BAV MS Vat. Gr. 2197.³⁵ We should note that, although Ficino wrote a long and intricate treatise on the fatal number enigmatically referred to by Plato in the *Republic* VIII at 546A1–D1, he knew nothing of Proclus' recondite analysis of that number's enigmas in the so-called *Melissa*, the thirteenth treatise of the *In Rempublicam*. He relied instead on other sources, including parts of Proclus' *In Timaeum* and their detailed analysis of mathematical passages in the *Timaeus*. Proclus' *In Rempublicam* had no role to play either, predictably so given Ficino's late encounter with it in the summer of 1492, in the orchestration of his argumenta for the ten books of the *Republic* in his 1484 Plato volume.

Fourthly and lastly, Ficino contributed a Latin version of an intriguing and substantive scholion for the *Sophist* which he attributed to Proclus. We now suppose it was probably composed by Olympiodorus whose commentary on the *Sophist* was still available to the Arabic translators.³⁶

32 See Gentile's entry no. 117 in *Mostra*.

33 See Viti's entry no. 160 in *Mostra*.

34 The first half of the *In Rempublicam*, i.e. dissertations I–XII, was translated again in the sixteenth century by Scutellius; and Conrad Gesner translated another section defending Homer against Plato's strictures. It survives in a rare printed edition apparently known to Thomas Taylor; see Kristeller, "Proclus as a Reader," 203–204.

35 It remained in the Vatican for all intents and purposes hidden from the scholarly world until a defective version of it appeared in 1886 edited by Richard Schoell. It was then authoritatively edited by Kroll in 1901 – in the second volume of his edition – though the text is full of lacunae and conjectural reconstructions, necessarily so given the damage to the MS's upper borders.

36 See the *Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo* 1: 22. I am indebted to L.G. Westerink for this reference. For a full study of the *Sophist* scholion, may I refer colleagues to my *Icastes*.

As a footnote, we might note that Proclus' *In Cratylum* was owned and excerpted by Francesco Patrizi (1529–1597), but never translated in the Renaissance, and whether Ficino engaged it or Proclus' *In Euclidem* awaits exploration.

• • •

Let us now return to Ficino's encounter with Proclus' *In Parmenidem*,³⁷ and to the introduction (*argumentum*) he wrote for Plato's dialogue itself in the early 1460s³⁸ when it appeared as the climactic finale in the batch of ten dialogues

-
- 37 Ficino's working copy of Proclus's *Parmenides* commentary has not yet been identified. Vanhaelen notes in her edition at xv–xvi that at least two copies of the Greek text circulated in Florence: the Laurenziana's Conv. Soppr. 103 (a Byzantine manuscript which was purchased by the Florentine Antonio Corbinelli and bequeathed to the Badia after 1425), and the Laurenziana's Pluteus 85,8 (copied by John Rhosos in 1489 at the request of Lorenzo de' Medici). Ficino had access to William of Moerbeke's Latin translation and may have used it throughout as Carlos Steel and Segonds both suggest, pace Vanhaelen's reservations (li). He must have used it at least for the final part of Proclus's commentary which is lost in the Greek original. See n. 11 above.
- 38 Francesca Lazzarin, "L'*Argumentum* in *Parmenidem* di Marsilio Ficino," *Accademia* 6 (2004): 7–34 (with a critical edition and Italian translation of Ficino's *argumentum* in *Parmenidem*). See my "Ficino's Theory of the Five Substances and the Neoplatonists' *Parmenides*," *Journal of Medieval & Renaissance Studies* 12, 1 (1983): 19–44; and "The Second Ficino-Pico Controversy: Parmenidean Poetry, Eristic and the One," in *Marsilio Ficino e il ritorno di Platone: studi e documenti*, ed. Gian Carlo Garfagnini, 2 vols. (Florence: Olschki, 1986), 417–455. Both pieces are now in my *Plato's Third Eye: Studies in Marsilio Ficino's Metaphysics and its Sources* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1995). Subsequently see also Alexandre Etienne, "Marsile Ficin, lecteur et interprète du *Parménide* à la Renaissance," in *Images de Platon et lectures de ses oeuvres: Les interprétations de Plato à travers les siècles*, ed. Ada B. Neschke-Hentschke (Paris-Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 153–185; Werner Beierwaltes, "L'interpretazione ficiniana del *Parmenide* platonico," in *Il Parmenide di Platone e la sua tradizione. Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale del Centro di Ricerca sul Neoplatonismo (Università degli Studi di Catania, 31 maggio-2 giugno 2001)*, ed. Maria Barbanti and Francesco Romano (Catania: Edizioni CUECM, 2002), 389–410; Francesca Lazzarin, "Note sull'interpretazione ficiniana del *Parmenide* di Platone," *Accademia* 5 (2003): 17–37; eadem, "L'*Argumentum*" 7–34. For the contretemps with Pico, see Raphael Ebgí's comments in his and Franco Bacchelli's edition, *Pico della Mirandola: Dell'Ente e dell'Uno* (Milan: Bompiani, 2010) 124–137: "Il *Parmenide* nel Rinascimento." See too Maude Vanhaelen, "The Pico-Ficino Controversy: New Evidence in Ficino's Commentary on Plato's *Parmenides*," *Rinascimento*, 2nd ser., XLIX (2009): 301–339 – this supersedes her earlier "L'Être et l'Un à la Renaissance: la réfutation du *De Ente et Uno* de Pic dans l'*In Parmenidem* de Ficin," in *All'eu moi katalekson: Mélanges de philosophie et de philologie offerts à Lambros Couloubaritsis*, ed. Michèle Broze, Baudouin Decharneux and Sylvain Delcominette (Paris: Vrin, 2008), 623–635.

that Ficino had hurried to translate for the ailing Cosimo, and the one which he apparently read to his patron on his deathbed along with the *Philebus*. This consolatory “reading” amounted to little more, perhaps, than Ficino’s having been asked to provide NeoPlatonic muzak, given Cosimo’s freshman Latin, his physical condition, and the convolutions of the arguments. Even so, as part of Cosimo’s own *ars moriendi*, it makes for a dramatic story.

Ficino later reused the *argumentum* as the introduction for his *Parmenides* translation as it appeared in the *Platonis Opera Omnia* of 1484, and then again as the preface for his long *In Parmenidem* published with his other Plato commentaries in 1496.³⁹ As early as the 1460s, however, it was already testifying to the awe investing the *Parmenides* for Ficino, given its primacy among the dialogues and its role as Plato’s compendium of universal theology. More pertinently, it demonstrates that Ficino was already familiar with the Proclian account of the dialogue’s structure and its account of the second part’s elaboration of the nine interconnected hypotheses predicated on the presence of the One or the consequences of postulating its absence.

The *argumentum* begins: “though Plato scattered the seeds of all his wisdom through all his dialogues,” he assembled the principles of moral philosophy in the *Republic* and all the knowledge of the natural world in the *Timaeus*. But “in the *Parmenides* he included the universal theology. This (as Proclus says) might seem unbelievable to other people, but is most certain for those in the [Platonic] family (*familiaribus*).” Even so, Ficino did not accord the dialogue quite the same status Proclus had conferred upon it. For Proclus had argued that the *Parmenides* was the consummation and perfection of all the other dialogues, and that, once mastered, it made reading the others unnecessary or at least supererogatory. Ficino was too much in love with the Platonic mysteries buried in the other dialogues, and not only in the *Republic* and *Timaeus* as suggested above, but preeminently in the *Symposium*, *Phaedrus*, *Phaedo*, *Statesman*, and *Letters*, to commit himself exclusively to this view of the *Parmenides*. Nonetheless he recognized it as the sovereign embodiment of Plato’s ontology and thus of his metaphysical theology.⁴⁰

In the other dialogues Plato puts a wide gap between himself and the other philosophers, Ficino argues, but in the *Parmenides* he “finally seems to excel even himself . . . for he appears to have been divinely inspired to produce this

39 See Vanhaelen’s note on the text of the *argumentum* in her edition 237–239. The following analysis is a reworking of some of the material in my two earlier articles cited in n. 38 above.

40 Were their *Parmenides* commentaries the last Plato commentaries respectively of Proclus and Ficino?

heavenly work from the sanctuaries of the divine mind and from philosophy's innermost shrine." This suggests that, while composing in this hierophantic frame, Plato was in a higher state of consciousness, and functioning as a seer rather than a philosopher. And the *argumentum* goes on to observe correspondingly that "Whoever embarks on the sacred reading of this text should prepare himself with soberness of soul and liberty of understanding (*sobrietate animi mentisque libertate*) before daring to take up the mysteries of this heavenly work." That is, the soul must be tempered and the mind liberated from bodily involvement before a disciple can even embark on a "sacred reading" (*sacra lectio*) of such a celestial work. In effect, the text is being accorded the status of scripture, and any person embarking on reading it must prepare himself inwardly, just as a priest prepares to officiate at Mass. Ficino accords no other dialogue quite this privileged status, though we must bear in mind that the Platonic tradition inherited from Pythagoreanism a commitment to inward preparation and discipleship, to the notion of a disciplined and guided initiation into correct interpretation. Indeed, we should recall that Ficino was constantly aware of the Pythagorean strains in Platonism, from Pythagoras himself to the Eleatics, particularly Parmenides and Melissus, and on to Plato and the succession of later Platonic exegetes, to end in Proclus himself. From this perspective, the later interpretation of the *Parmenides* was one of the triumphs of Pythagoreanism, and Proclus emerged as a lineal descendant of the Pythagoreans.

The challenge, says Ficino, is that the divine Plato has confronted us with a "most subtle series of arguments concerning the One as the one principle of all and the source of all; for Plato examines how the One is outside all and within all, and how all exist from it, through it and for it."⁴¹ This obviously refers to the challenges of the dialogue's second part beginning at 137C4 with a youth called Aristotle (not the Stagirite) as the respondent, and not to the theory of Ideas explored in the first part where the young Socrates was the respondent. It underscores that Ficino was apprised of the Neoplatonic reading from early on in his career, that is, from the early 1460s when he completed his rendering of the dialogue for Cosimo and prepared the *argumentum* to accompany it. In other words the *skopos* of the dialogue is not *De ideis*, as was mooted on occasions in antiquity, and as we might anticipate from reading only the first part of the dialogue; but rather *De uno*, the One being the subject of the second part by way of both affirmation and negation, and the source of the Ideas. Plato leads us from Zeno's concern with the principle of unity in sensibles, to

41 Ed. Vanhaelen, 2–9, i.e. Ficino's *Opera*, 1136–37. See my "Ficino's Theory of the Five Substances," 24.

Socrates' corresponding concern with the same principles in intelligibles, and thus to a consideration of the Ideas "in which the unities of things consist." Finally, Parmenides, the eldest of the speakers, turns to the reason or rational principle underlying the Ideas (or, more literally, to 'the entire reason' of the Ideas), not in order to refute Zeno or Socrates, but to bring their unfinished contemplation to completion. That is, we are taken to successively higher levels of viewing unity; and the triple enquiry climaxes with Parmenides himself advancing the primary questions about the existence and nature of the Ideas.

The second part is concerned with the transcendent One, the One beyond the unity immanent in the Ideas. From a Neoplatonic point of view, the history of the interpretation of the dialogue is one of a series of interpretative breakthroughs, beginning with Plotinus but culminating with that of Plutarch of Athens (ca. 350–430) and then of Syrianus (d. 437), Proclus' teacher. It has been well analyzed by Saffrey, Westerink, Beierwaltes and others. That Ficino was familiar with this account is clear not only from the *argumentum* but also from chapters 37, 52 and 56 of his own *In Parmenidem*, where he affirms that "Proclus followed Syrianus in supposing that individual mysteries were hidden in individual words and that the number of individual conclusions usually corresponded to the number of individual divinities (37.2),"⁴² an interpretation which is keyed to the conclusions attendant on the second hypothesis (52.3, 56.3), and which Ficino rejects (80.3).⁴³

Finally, the *argumentum* exhorts us to follow Pythagorean precedent and to recognize that Plato uses the terms 'one' and 'other' in the dialogue in various oppositional ways: 'one' for instance can refer not only to the transcendent One but to the two grand hypostases free of matter, namely Mind and Soul and all they embrace. 'Other' may refer to matter or to material forms. We have to bear this always in mind lest we mistake the dialogue's content and structure, which are so matched that we cannot understand them apart: hence the requirement that we acquire an inward sobriety and liberty.⁴⁴

Decades later, after 7 November 1492, Ficino began to compile his own full-scale *Parmenides* commentary which was completed before August 1494 and published in 1496. In the *proemium*, which immediately follows the original *argumentum*, he raises the contentious question as to why a work that was "for the most part theological" is cast in a dialectical form (giving rise of course to

42 See my "Ficino's Theory of the Five Substances," 33–34.

43 80.3: "'we do not intend to introduce as many divinities as there are conclusions' lest we end up siding with Proclus in postulating eight gods from the tenses of 'to be' and 'to become'."

44 See my "The Second Ficino-Pico Controversy," 432–437.

the ancient notion that the work was merely a dialectical or logical exercise). Ficino retorts that “it was the custom of Pythagoras, of Socrates, and of Plato to conceal divine mysteries everywhere in figures and veils.” The result was ‘jesting in seriousness’ and ‘playing in earnest’ – a philosophical wittiness that evoked Lucian and Apuleius as well as Plato and Plotinus and that reminds us of the reference in the *Laws* 803C to the ‘playful gods’ who use men as their puppets. Correspondingly, we have to cultivate an inner *laetitia* or playfulness if we are to interpret correctly. Even so, it comes as a surprise to see Ficino referring to the wit of the *Parmenides* as if it were the supreme example of Plato at play or the ultimate Platonic game designed to ‘exercise the wit’ and incite it to “the contemplation of divine dogmas.” Ficino clearly thinks that Plato had remained faithful to Pythagorean example in mixing themes and motifs in imitation of nature’s variety: in particular the *Parmenides* melds matters divine with demonstration, the highest dialectical strategy that “is based on universal not particular principles.” In other words, *Parmenides* himself is a dialectician instructing us in the most advanced procedure of enquiry even as he is initiating us into the proper subject of that skill, the highest matters of theology. Ficino notes by way of further confirmation that the *Republic* too mixes theology and dialectic together.⁴⁵ The proem is a justification, in short, of the dialogue’s logical format in terms of the arresting notion of Platonic play, a notion that Ficino also saw at the heart of Proclus’ brimming analyses – not surprisingly given the cognate notion that playing in seriousness was the very hallmark of what Ficino thinks of as the Platonic family.⁴⁶

Again, it was Proclus who gave Ficino this notion of a succession of Platonists who had established the theological status of the whole dialogue, and especially of its second part, and who had detected a sublime order in what Raymond Klibansky, an expert in the history of the *Parmenides*, was still calling in 1943 “the bewildering array of [its] conflicting hypotheses.”⁴⁷ On the basis of Proclus’ account in the *Platonic Theology* 1.1, Ficino tells us at the close of chapter 38 that Plato’s successors, his *familiares*, elevated the One and the Good over Being and Intellect; and that they included “each and every upright Platonist: Plutarch [of Chaeronea], Ammonius, Plotinus, Amelius, Porphyry, Iamblichus, Theodorus of Asine, and their followers.”⁴⁸ Ficino also toys with

45 Cf. Ficino’s *In Parmenidem* 40.

46 For Platonic play, cf. *Opera*, 1129 (the dedicatory proem to Lorenzo for the 1484 Plato edition: it later also served as the proem for Ficino’s Plato commentaries).

47 “Plato’s *Parmenides* in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance,” 307.

48 Ed. Saffrey and Westerink, 1. 6.16 ff.; Ficino adds Plutarch [of Chaeronea] and Ammonius to Proclus’s list.

the idea of what he calls here an ‘old school,’ which must have included the figures listed above, and a ‘new school,’ which stemmed from Syrianus and Proclus, “eminent men indeed who were in agreement,” and which later also included Hermias, Damascius,⁴⁹ and Olympiodorus. The old school is not the Old Academy or a later Academy, but rather the ‘school’ of eminent philosophers stemming from Plutarch of Chaeronea who maintained correctly that Plato had elevated the One above Being and Intellect. Though they had not yet arrived at the full-fledged Syrianian account of the *Parmenides* and its nine hypotheses, still they had interpreted it metaphysically and thus in large part correctly.

In chapter 51, which is entitled *Dispositio propositionum Parmenidis apud Plutarchum*,⁵⁰ Ficino turns to the other, the later Plutarch, the Plutarch of Athens from Proclus’ account; and he proceeds to treat in detail of the first five hypotheses in the second part of the *Parmenides* 137C4–160D2. He begins with the notion that the first three treat of the three substances separated from matter – i.e. of the One, Intellect and Soul – as ‘one,’ while the next two treat of corporeal form and matter, fulfilling as they do their work from within matter, as ‘other.’ The first three serve as prime causes, the last two as accompanying causes. The last four of the nine hypotheses by contrast, i.e. 160D3–166C5, demonstrate that, if the One did not exist, then various absurdities would ensue: hypotheses 2 to 5 and 6 to 9 correspond, while the first hypothesis is unique. Ficino is in fact lucidly paraphrasing a passage in Book VI of Proclus’ *In Parmenidem*.⁵¹

The end of chapter 52 introduces a further refinement that in a way recaptures the first hypothesis. The first and fifth hypotheses, Ficino writes, proceed via negations: the first denies all things of the One, using negation to signify the sublime power of the cause and its incomparable excellence. The fifth denies all things of the last [i.e. of matter] and uses negation to signify privation, inadequacy, and defect. The second and fourth use only affirmations: the second as exemplars, the fourth as images. The third hypothesis as the mean accords with Soul as the mean, and because of this is composed of affirmations

49 No evidence suggests that Ficino knew of Damascius’s *Parmenides* commentary, the other important late Neoplatonic interpretation and especially of the second hypothesis; see Saffrey and Westerink’s various comments in their edition of Proclus’s *Theologia Platonica*, 3: lxxviii–xciv, 4: xli–lxiii, 5: xxxviii–lvi, and 6: xci–xcvii.

50 In Ficino’s *Opera*, 1165, the chapter is misnumbered LV.

51 Ed. Victor Cousin, *Procli Philosophi Platonici Opera Inedita*, 2nd ed. (Paris: A. Durand, 1864), cols. 1058–60. This edition has now been superseded by Carlos Steel’s magisterial *Procli In Platonis Parmenidem Commentaria*, cited in n. 11 above.

and negations coordinated together.⁵² This passage depends in part on Proclus' *Platonic Theology* 1.12 and supplies us with decisive evidence that Ficino knew both the *In Parmenidem* and the *Platonic Theology* and could work back and forth between them.

In sum, Proclus provided Ficino with the substance and history of the Neoplatonic search for the ultimate reading of the *Parmenides*; and Ficino in turn became the Renaissance scholar who best understood Proclus – more profoundly so than even Cusanus and Bessarion, let alone the haughty young Pico who had rushed, according to the older Ficino, into a rash and ill-informed interpretation of Plato's greatest dialogue based on a logical and not a truly metaphysical reading. If it was the 'inmost sanctuary' of Plato's thought for Ficino, for Pico it was apparently "nothing but a dialectical exercise" (*nihil aliud est quam dialectica quaedam exercitatio*), and one that was especially vulnerable to the violence of "arbitrary and precipitate commentaries" (*arbitrariae et violentae enarrationes*). In adopting this latter view, Pico was of course reviving an ancient perspective on the dialogue, one espoused for example by Alcinous (Albinus) who had interpreted it as essentially eristical or obstetrical and not, or not primarily, as dogmatic or doctrinal.⁵³

However indebted to Proclus' complex interpretation of the dialogue, Ficino nonetheless takes interesting issue with Proclus and the *Syrianici* in general, and is at pains to distinguish his views from theirs. In chapter 37 he declares that he cannot accept the *Syrianici's* view that every word in the dialogue is theologically significant.⁵⁴ For Plato had mingled logical and theological difficulties and had selected Socrates, not as a mature initiate, but as a youth still awaiting instruction: Plato, that is, had mingled various elements together that had to be interpreted in various ways. The commitment to maintaining that "individual mysteries lie hidden away in every single word and that the number of propositions equals the number of divinities" was the error, "however understandable," of Syrianus and of his most prolific disciple, Proclus.⁵⁵ Ficino is referring one assumes to Proclus' assumptions: a) that everything denied of the One in the first hypothesis is secretly being predicated of the second hypostasis Mind; b) that all negation in the dialogue is inverted affirmation;

52 52.4 (ed. Vanhaelen), i.e. *Opera*, 1167.1.

53 Ed. Eugenio Garin, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: De hominis dignitate, Heptaplus, De ente et uno, e scritti vari* (Florence: Vallecchi, 1942), 390.

54 Vanhaelen has advanced a problematic thesis that chapter 37 is the first of thirteen intruded chapters specifically aimed at refuting Pico's arguments.

55 Cf. Ficino's *In Parmenidem* 90.2, 94.2–4: "one should not derive individual gods from each little clause" (ed. Vanhaelen).

and c) that every abstraction or attribution signifies a divinity in a particular category of gods, hypercosmic or encosmic. Proclus, in sum, had been wrong to regard every word and 'each little clause' as a theological cipher, and had in consequence interpreted the text too rigidly because too literally.

Ficino contests this literalist view just as he had contested the ancient Albinian and the modern Piconian error that held the work was just a logical exercise. In taking pains to separate himself from the *Syrianici*, he is going to tread, he says, 'the middle path' on the assumption that there is "only as much underlying theology as the artifice, or what is commonly called the dialectic, allows." For Ficino, judgements about divine matters are not "wholly or continuously or ubiquitously present" but rather are divulged on occasions.⁵⁶ Thus, although the *Syrianici* can serve as guides, Ficino says at the end of the discussion of the first hypothesis, to interpret the remaining hypotheses any interpreter must rely on himself and on God. In other words, Ficino adheres yet again to the notion of a playful Plato who only intermittently reveals dogmas in "a serious and businesslike game" (*ludum serium negociosumque*) (137B2) that weaves together theological with logical concerns and requires a flexible, intuitive response that can only come from 'sobriety' of soul and 'liberty' of understanding.⁵⁷ In a way we must toy with the *Parmenides* and its mysteries as the gods delight to toy with men.

In the opening of chapter 103, in taking up the sixth hypothesis, Ficino sees this challenge in terms of poetry, not surprisingly given that Parmenides himself was a poet. His fragmentary *Poema* tells of a chariot ride up through the gates of Night and Day to encounter an anonymous goddess who then instructs him in the ultimate mysteries. It is against the backdrop of the *Poema* and other poetic fragments attributed to Parmenides that Ficino therefore interprets what he thinks of as the poetry of the dialogue: "Parmenides was not only a philosopher but also a divine poet . . . and in this dialogue he also played the poet." As evidence, Ficino boldly links the choice of nine hypotheses with the number of the Muses, and plays with the Pythagorean-Neoplatonic interpretation of Apollo, the Muses' leader, as "the not of many." Other poetic features include the varying of terms and their meanings – of 'one' and 'other' as we have already mentioned – but above all the feigning of "what does not exist and could never exist" – the traditional failing, though some would declare it the traditional calling, of poets, who rejoice in allusions. Additionally, Parmenides frequently resorts to poetic 'paradoxes' and to the "hiding of one thing under the name of another" and by 'name' here Ficino takes him to mean

⁵⁶ Ibid. 37.2.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 37.2 and argumentum 2 (ed. Vanhaelen).

terms such as the Good and the One (as chapter 40 makes clear). Parmenides “delighted in metaphors,” says Ficino, and “used them to attribute untypical or unexpected (*aliena*) meanings to things. The result of the deployment of all these poetic techniques is that “almost every aspect of the words requires allegory.” For “under the dialectical form, he often adds mystical dogmas, not in every sentence but in different passages . . . everywhere however he feigns difficulties and lays out paradoxes.”⁵⁸ Again, while this certainly points to the complexity and variety of the verbal surface of the dialogue, it is not aligning itself with Proclus’ literal response to words that require non-literal allegorisation and figurative exegesis. Ficino adduces the *Theaetetus* 166C–168C, where, he says, we should strive not to be deceived by the art Plato has deployed, and not to “take both the words and what they signify in a sense at variance from what Plato himself intends.” Plato in short, like Parmenides before him, was a poet and we must interpret him therefore as a poetic philosopher. And this Proclus had failed to do.

Before turning to a detailed exposition of the last four of the nine hypotheses, Ficino asks provocatively in chapter 103 “What do a dialectician and a poet have in common?” And he answers, “almost everything” (*certe quam plurimum*); for both the dialectician and the poet “busy themselves with their own conceits and their own devices; and both are deemed divine and possess something of madness.” Hence in the *Parmenides* we find something of madness too; for it depicts the old man as a poet and it is itself the masterpiece of a Plato who had begun his career as a poet. Witness the abundance of poetry in the *Phaedrus* which was purportedly for Ficino Plato’s first dialogue; and witness too the youthful poetic tragedies that Plato is said to have burned. Again, the failure of the *Syrianici* and of Proclus was the failure both to recognize the essential poetry of this great dialogue, and to respond to it in a sufficiently flexible way – and this despite their profound insight into the relationship of the hypotheses to the hypostases and their determination of the correct number of hypotheses.

This attack on Proclus is all the more striking given the praise accorded Dionysius in the *In Parmenidem* 37.3 as the authoritative reader of the dialogue, praise for an achievement that, Ficino supposed, had long predated Proclus’ attempt. This is of course ironic, given what we now know of the true dating. Since Dionysius was the object of veneration as the greatest of all the Platonists and the teacher of a Christian Platonism already perfected in the first century AD, Proclus and the *Syrianici* must have learned about the structure of the *Parmenides* from reading Dionysius who, Ficino affirmed, had

⁵⁸ Ibid. 90.2–4, 103.1–2 (ed. Vanhaelen).

completely understood Plato's supreme work and drawn upon its arguments. Indeed, Dionysius' negative theologizing was the triumphant outcome of his understanding of Plato's deployment of negations. He had even transcended the poetic reading Ficino had been advocating earlier in the first embedded poem. For he had come to understand the power of the apophatic, of the radical nay-saying that amounts to a kind of poetry by way of denial and concealment. Whereas Proclus by contrast had been led to an excessively particular interpretation, Dionysius long before him had understood that the dialogue undermines all such predication: that everywhere it deploys the poetry of no-thing-ness, of non-being, of "absence, darkness, death, Things which are not" – to co-opt Donne's haunting phrases. This is at the opposite end of the spectrum from the merely 'dialectical exercise' that Pico had brushed aside as effectively subordinate to the greater works of Aristotle. For its apophaticism is the divine night of a poetry beyond being, the deep but dazzling darkness of a Sinai where for forty days and nights Moses had been an ecstatic poet, prophet, and dialectician.

All this points yet again to the justice of Kristeller's observation that in determining the 'source' for Ficino, and for the Renaissance at large, of what initially seems to be a Proclian idea, we should always first turn to the Areopagite, the Christian Proclus who had preceded the pagan Proclus by five centuries.⁵⁹

59 "Proclus as a Reader" 196.

De-essentializing the World

Valla, Agricola, Vives, and Nizolio on Universals and Topics

Lodi Nauta

Introduction

In this contribution I would like to address an old question that concerns the possible affinity between Renaissance humanism and medieval nominalism. It is a question that continues to be debated among scholars, and opinions are divided of course.¹ The issue is this: many humanists criticized the medieval scholastics for their terminology, language, and approach in philosophy and theology. They disliked words such as *entitas*, *quidditas*, and *haeceitas*, which they found not only ungrammatical and ugly Latin but also misleading, because these words might create a belief in the existence of such abstract entities. Now such criticisms can already be found among the nominalists, who were, of course, still working within the scholastic Aristotelian framework. A nominalist such as William of Ockham, for instance, rejected the existence of abstract things such as universals. He found the introduction of abstract terms in philosophy dangerous because it could easily lead to the conviction that such entities do in fact exist. Since this criticism reminds us of the humanist critique of scholastic language, historians have frequently regarded

1 On the affirmative side see, e.g., Eckhard Kessler, "Die Transformation des aristotelischen Organon durch Lorenzo Valla," in *Aristotelismus und Renaissance. In memoriam Charles B. Schmitt*, ed. Eckhard Kessler et al. (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1988), 53–74; id., "Die verborgene Gegenwart Ockhams in der Sprachphilosophie der Renaissance," in *Die Gegenwart Ockhams*, ed. Wilhelm Vossenkuhl and Rolf Schönberger (Weinheim: vch-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1990), 147–164. On the skeptical side see John Monfasani, "Lorenzo Valla and Rudolph Agricola," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 28 (1990): 181–200; repr. in his *Language and Learning in Renaissance Italy. Selected Articles* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1994), no. v; Wolfgang Hübener, "Die Nominalismus-Legende. Über das Mißverhältnis zwischen Dichtung und Wahrheit in der Deutung der Wirkungsgeschichte des Ockhamismus," in *Spiegel und Gleichnis. Festschrift für Jacob Taubes*, ed. Norbert W. Bolz and Wolfgang Hübener (Würzburg: Koenigshausen and Neuman, 1983), 87–111. See Lodi Nauta, *In Defense in Common Sense. Lorenzo Valla's Humanist Critique of Scholastic Philosophy* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 296 n. 5 for more references. The literature is extensive.

these humanists as stepping in the footsteps of the nominalists, and they have looked for quotations, references or allusions to nominalist authors – mainly Ockham – in the writings of humanists.

It does not require much reflection to realize that such an issue can hardly be discussed in these general terms. If it often already proves difficult to speak of the influence of thinker X on thinker Y, it is almost impossible to postulate an influence of an ‘-ism’ on another ‘-ism,’ though historians often find themselves unable to avoid this (“the influence of medieval Augustinianism on the rising tide of Aristotelianism”).² In this particular case we are working with highly slippery, even essentially contested concepts. Humanism is of course a concept that is notoriously difficult to define, and even if we tie the term to the fifteenth-century usage of ‘humanista,’ a term that meant a student of the *studia humanitatis*, there is still much debate over the question who or what counts as a humanist. In the late Renaissance we find ‘humanist’ methods employed in a wide range of disciplines, something which is reflected in descriptions such as ‘medical humanism,’ ‘humanist chronology,’ ‘humanist science,’ to the brink of becoming unclear what exactly is ‘humanist’ about it. Humanism was thus not a monolithic movement: it had its own transmutations, and depending on time and place could take different forms. Nominalism too is a slippery concept, and scholarship of the last two decades has shown that it is highly problematic to postulate the existence of “a continuous stream that we can call Ockhamism from 1330 to 1530.”³ In Italy, for instance, Ockhamism was largely absent from theological thinking due to the lack of theological faculties.⁴ Terminist logic was flourishing in fifteen-century Italy but the vast majority of humanists chose to remain in blissful ignorance of it. The names of these logicians were objects of scorn rather than sources of inspirations. The situation

2 On the concept of influence, see Quentin Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas,” in id., *Visions of Politics*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 57–89, on 74–76.

3 William J. Courtenay, *Ockham and Ockhamism. Studies in the Dissemination and Impact of His Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 378.

4 John Monfasani, “Aristotelians, Platonists, and the Missing Ockhamists: Philosophical Liberty in Pre-Reformation Italy,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 46 (1993): 248: “But Italy lacked colleges or any sort of corporate bodies of secular theologians. Consequently, she was devoid of any tradition of Ockhamism in theology. Not having Ockhamist theologians, she also missed the competition between the two *viae*, the *Wegestreit* which cut across theology and arts faculties.” Many scholars have of course commented on the difficulty of defining these “-isms.” See, e.g., Alister E. McGrath, *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* 2nd ed. (Malden MA: Blackwell, 2004), chapters 2 (on humanism) and 3 (on nominalism). In fact, most such studies begin by saying something about these difficulties.

in northern Europe was different with the emergence of schools of thought such as 'the Thomists,' 'the Albertists,' 'the Scotists,' and 'the nominalists' or 'Ockhamists,' and by the end of the fifteenth century Ockham "became textually wedded to the 'modern' approach and an important authority for the *Nominalistae* at Paris and universities in Germany."⁵ What is understood by nominalism or Ockhamism (and these two are not the same, obviously) thus depends on time, place, and institutional context.

With these two slippery concepts, the question of the influence of the one on the other cannot but give a slippery answer. Yet the question is not completely devoid of historical sense. Some humanists explicitly showed sympathy for the *nominales*, and a few had more than an inkling of knowledge about ideas that were associated with the *via moderna* in the fifteenth-century schools.⁶ And even though their methods, approaches, and aims were vastly different, the outcome of the humanists' criticisms of some aspects of scholastic thought looks rather similar to those of the nominalists, even though similarity might prove to be deceptive on closer examination. So if we want to study possible affinities between two such '-isms', this can only be done on a case-by-case basis, and we need to be cautious in our generalizations, if only because the majority of humanists were not interested in these philosophical issues at all. Yet a historian might also detect (or want to detect) patterns over a longer period of time, patterns that transcend the here and now of the individual author with his or her time-bounded questions. In the long run the scholastic traditions came under attack, and early modern philosophers – for all their claims to originality and modernity – were indebted to humanist scholarship and nominalist reductions, no less than to Thomist and Scotist traditions, and to the new science and many other developments that took place in the period that we call the Renaissance but which, according to some historians, was just the last phase of the Middle Ages.⁷ From such a general point of view too the question of how these developments might have reinforced or rather hindered each other (if at all) is worth exploring. With these general caveats in mind, I propose to look at four humanists who have been assigned an important role in the humanist critique of scholastic thought or, as some scholars would like

5 Courtenay, *Ockham and Ockhamism*, 105.

6 I will come back to this point at the end of my article.

7 John Monfasani, "The Renaissance as the Concluding Phase of the Middle Ages," *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano Per Il Medio Evo* 108 (2006): 165–85.

to put it,⁸ the transformation of scholastic themes in new directions: Lorenzo Valla (1406–1457), Rudolph Agricola (1444–1485), Juan Luis Vives (1492–1540), and Mario Nizolio (1488–1567).

Lorenzo Valla

Lorenzo Valla was one of the fiercest critics of scholastic thinking. His *Repastinatio dialectice et philosophie* – or, to use the title of a sixteenth-century editor, the *Dialectical Disputations* – is a sustained attack on what he regards as the foundations of this scholastic edifice, of which Aristotle, Porphyry, Boethius, Thomas Aquinas, and Peter of Spain were the master builders, assisted by an army of less well-known dialecticians and theologians.⁹ As John Monfasani has rightly said “as Valla’s most comprehensive work, touching on grammar, rhetoric, classical philology, moral philosophy, physics, metaphysics, theology, and even biology in addition to logic, the *Dialectica* aimed at nothing less than a total reformation of the contemporary scientific culture of scholasticism.”¹⁰ The quality of Valla’s arguments does not always match the sharpness of his pen (to put it mildly), but its importance lies indeed in its grand plan, scope, and methods. What makes Valla’s critique philosophically interesting is precisely his anti-philosophical sentiment.¹¹ For him thinking about man and the world should be done on a wholly different basis than what was common in scholastic traditions, looking to rhetoric and grammar rather than metaphysics and logic for inspiration and guidelines. Theory and speculation easily make us blind for the concrete and practical way in which people actually argue, speak, and think, and express their faith. It was not only

8 So Eckhard Kessler, “Die Transformation des aristotelischen Organon durch Lorenzo Valla,” 55, arguing that humanism is to be regarded “nicht als ‘Wiederbelebung des klassischen Altertums’ durch Überwindung der Scholastik sondern als Transformation der scholastisch-aristotelischen Tradition mit Hilfe antiker Denkelemente (...)”. And the polemics of the humanists show that “sie noch an diese gebunden sind und das Neue, das sie vertreten, auf die scholastische Tradition bezogen ist und nur von ihr her, als Antwort auf ihre Probleme, verstanden werden kann.”

9 Ed. and trans. Brian P. Copenhaver and Lodi Nauta in the I Tatti Renaissance Library (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 2 vols. The paragraph on Valla is based on Nauta, *In Defense of Common Sense*.

10 Monfasani, review of Zippel’s edition of the *Repastinatio*, in *Rivista di letteratura italiana* 2 (1984): 177–194; repr. in his *Language and Learning*, no. vi.

11 Nauta, *In Defense of Common Sense*, 272–73.

Aristotle and the scholastics who were his targets – in fact, Valla's knowledge of what we now consider as the main authorities seems meager – but also late-classical grammarians, and also occasionally classical authorities and Church Fathers (e.g. Augustine in his speculations about the Trinity).

In view of his staunch criticism of anything scholastic, we would not expect Valla to praise the work of William of Ockham, and indeed the only time Valla mentions Ockham's name is in a negative way: in a letter to his friend Giovanni Serra he gives a list of those "barbarous" dialecticians.¹² Yet modern scholars have often detected a nominalist strain in Valla's work. They are struck by Valla's reductive aim to cut down scholastic concepts and distinctions in a way that brings to mind Ockham's nominalist project. Ockham's razor cuts through categories, transcendentals, universals, abstract entities of various sorts. Abstract terms might suggest the existence of such entities, but we should resist the temptation to postulate things as referents of such abstract terminology. All there is are substances and qualities, and terminology that seems to refer to the existence of something beyond these two basic categories, must be rendered harmless by reducing it to terminology referring to these latter two categories.¹³ Valla too wields a razor, and though the workshop where his razor was sharpened is called rhetoric and grammar rather than terministic logic, the motivation – according to this interpretation – is more or less the same. Hence, we find a similarly lean ontology in Valla, which exists of substances, qualities, and actions. We also find a reduction of the transcendental terms ('good,' 'one,' 'true,' 'something,' 'being,' 'thing') to just one, 'thing,' and we find similar *skopsis* concerning other matters. These similarities, however, are superficial, outweighed by important differences in objective, argument, and method. Since I have compared the two extensively in my Valla book, I will summarize just a few salient points.¹⁴

Valla's treatment of the Aristotelian categories is vastly different from Ockham's. For Ockham the Aristotelian categories do not describe things in the world but categorize terms – relational terms (such as father), temporary

12 Valla, *Epistole*, ed. Ottavio Besomi and Mariangela Regoliosi (Padua: Antenore, 1984), 201: "aut illos dialecticos, Albertum utrunque, Strodem, Occam, Paulum Venetum." In his *Encomium of St Thomas Aquinas* Valla gives a similar list of "new theologians – Albert the Great, Giles [of Rome], Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure, John Scotus and the others," in *Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Leonard A. Kennedy (The Hague: Mouton, 1973), 24.

13 This is a bit too quick. For a good succinct discussion see Claude Panaccio, "Semantics and Mental Language," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ockham*, ed. Paul Vincent Spade (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 53–75.

14 *In Defense of Common Sense*, in particular chapters 1–3.

terms (such as yesterday) etc. – by which we describe an individual thing. Ockham thus rejects a realist interpretation of the categories in order to *defend* the Aristotelian categories as distinct groups of terms. Valla's motivation is different. For Valla the three categories that he admits categorize *things*: they describe real things in the world: substances, with their qualities and actions. The other categories have no function and can be abolished: from a grammatical point of view all such terms just describe the quality of something. His grammatical approach leads to wholly different results than does Ockham's logical approach.

On universals too the differences are significant. Ockham's program is explicitly addressed to the question how a nominalist, who admits of only singular entities, can explain generality in thought and language without having recourse to universals. His solution is to ground spoken and written language on the mental language of our concepts, that is, singular entities in the mind which stand for their singular referents. Valla, on the other hand, does not refer to mental concepts as the primary language on which to ground the meanings of spoken and written language. He does not deal with the philosophical problem of generality, and what he writes against the use of abstract terms and concepts is motivated by his aversion to ungrammatical Latin and his wish to stay within the limits drawn by the imagination and the senses.

On other subjects too we can find similar differences between Ockham and Valla, and this is of course not surprising: As a logician Ockham is interested in the logic of natural language rather than in the grammatical features of Latin or any other specific type of language, while as a humanist Valla approaches everything from a grammatical and rhetorical point of view. As suggested, this grammatical approach leads to a rejection of abstract entities but the inspiration of this de-essentializing tendency is not Ockhamistic or nominalistic – at least not in a philosophically technical sense of the word. The final results of Valla's simplification and reduction of terms and distinctions may sometimes look similar to Ockham's ontology, but Ockham's razor was of a wholly different kind than Valla's.

Rudolph Agricola

My second case study is Rudolph Agricola, famous for his dialectical manual, *De inventione dialectica*, published 30 years after his death in 1485. In this work, which was truly a bestseller in the sixteenth century, Agricola tries to bring together rhetoric and dialectic into one system of topical invention, showing how we can find arguments by using a set of places or topics (*loci*) such

as definition, genus, species, place, time, similars, opposites, and so forth.¹⁵ Agricola has a place in our story, however, because he also wrote a small treatise on universals earlier in his life. In this treatise he seems to accept the existence of universals, even though at least one modern scholar has argued that his definition of the universal “is analogous to Ockham’s definition of the universal sign” and hence that his position is compatible with nominalism.¹⁶ I think this brief treatise on universals can be seen as an early step in Agricola’s long-term project of revising and re-organizing the systems of topics as he found them in Aristotle, Cicero, and Boethius.¹⁷ Let me briefly discuss this point.

In this treatise Agricola argues – quite traditionally – that a universal is what things have in common, e.g. animal is common to horse, cow and man. A universal is thus, he writes, “a certain essential similitude” (*essentialis similitudo*); it is that which makes things similar to each other.¹⁸ This is quite a realist view of universals, and indeed his further discussion shows a general debt to the school of Duns Scotus, which he explicitly mentions (*Ioanni Scoti secta*).¹⁹ Scotus had argued that e.g. Socrates and Plato have the form humanity in common but

-
- 15 Peter Mack, *Renaissance Argument. Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic* (Leiden: Brill, 1993). For a concise treatment see also Mack’s *History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 56–75. For another good discussion see Marc Cogan, “Rodolphus Agricola and the Semantic Revolutions of the History of Invention,” *Rhetorica* 2, 2 (1984): 163–194 on the topical systems of Cicero, Boethius and Agricola, and their differences.
 - 16 Kessler, “Die verborgene Gegenwart Ockhams,” 151: “in Analogie zu Ockhams Definition des universalen Zeichens.” Cf. Markus Friedrich, “‘War Rudolf Agricola Nominalist?’ Zur Bedeutung der Philosophie Ockhams für den Sprachhumanismus,” in *Res et Verba in der Renaissance*, ed. Eckhard Kessler and Ian Maclean (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002), 369–88.
 - 17 On this treatise as well as a second little treatise that Agricola wrote on the same theme, see Lodi Nauta, “From Universals to Topics: The Realism of Rudolph Agricola, with an Edition of his Reply to a Critic,” *Vivarium* 50 (2012): 190–224, with an edition of this second treatise.
 - 18 The treatise is incorporated in Alardus of Amsterdam’s edition of Agricola’s *De inventione dialectica* (Cologne: Johann Gymnich, 1539; repr. Nieuwkoop: de Graaf, 1967); the quotation appears at 38.
 - 19 Scotus was allowed at Louvain by a decision of 1446, as mentioned by Jan Papy, “The reception of Agricola’s *De inventione dialectica* in the teaching of logic at the Louvain faculty of arts in the early sixteenth century,” in *Northern Humanism in European Context, 1469–1625*, ed. Fokke Akkerman et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 169, n. 12, while Ockham “was a stranger in Louvain and remained as such in the commentaries [on Aristotle’s *Organon*] of 1535” (170). Maarten Dorp, however, was able to praise Ockham in glowing terms in a treatise from 1512, as Demmy Verbeke suggests in a forthcoming article on Dorp.

what makes the one different from the other is not a piece of bodily matter but an individual form, a 'this-ness' (*haeceitas*): Plato has a unique this-ness and Socrates has his own unique this-ness, added to the universal humanity they share.²⁰ Without discussing the intricacies of Scotist philosophy, Agricola accepts the existence of such a principle of individuation. He seems to follow Scotist teaching in thinking that universals as common natures exist independent of the intellect but that 'community' is something that arises only because the mind notices and judges things as similar in a particular respect. In this way Agricola tries to do justice to the individuality of things while at the same time believing that the common patterns we see are grounded in reality.

The same conviction also informs his work on the topics, *De inventione dialectica*, even though this work does not address such theoretical issues directly. Topics (*loci*) or seats of argumentation, such as definition, genus, species, property, whole, parts and so on, can be seen as headings which we can use to list things that two things have in common or do not have in common, which is important in making arguments. If we want to argue that a dog is an animal we can make use of the topic genus. Topics thus help us to see the agreements and disagreements between two things, because topics are what all things have in common: each thing, e.g., belongs to a genus, each thing has a certain substance, is caused by something, has a certain effect, is at a certain place, and so on. This is also how the topics were invented in the first place:

All things which are said either for or against something fit together and are, so to speak, joined with it by a certain community of nature (*quadam naturae societate*). Now the number of things is immense and consequently the number of their properties (*proprietas*) and differences (*diversitas*) is also immense. This is the reason why no discourse and no power of the human mind can comprehend individually all the relations in which individuals agree and differ. However a certain common condition (*communis quaedam habitudo*) is present in all things (even though they are different in their appearances), and they all tend to a similarity

20 See e.g. Timothy B. Noone, "Universals and Individuation," in *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus*, ed. Thomas Williams (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 100–28, on 105; Constantino Marmo, "Ontology and Semantics in the Logic of Duns Scotus," in *On the Medieval Theory of Signs*, ed. Umberto Eco and Constantino Marmo (Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1989), 143–93. Jorge J.E. Garcia, "Individuality and the Individuating Entity in Scotus's *Ordinatio*: An Ontological Characterization," in *John Duns Scotus: Metaphysics and Ethics*, ed. Ludger Honnefelder et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 246. Cf. Nauta, "From Universals to Topics," 201–205.

of their nature (*naturae similitudinem*). So, for example, every thing has a certain substance of its own, certain causes from which it arises, certain effects it produces. And so the cleverest men have picked out (*excerpere*), from that vast variety of things, these common headings (*communia capita*) such as substance, cause, effect and the others . . .²¹

Topics are universal aspects of things, and hence direct our attention to what two things, A and B, have in common or not. Some of the Aristotelian categories and the predicables are thus included in the list of topics, but the topics contain more than the traditional set of universals; they are rather universal aspects of things, and hence a good starting point for speaking about them.²²

Now to some extent the *De inventione dialectica* can be regarded as a development from the early treatise on universals. In both works Agricola emphasizes the common aspects of things, aspects that enable us to categorize and talk about things without denying their fundamental unicity and individuality. But while in his early treatise he talked about universals as “essential similitudes,” in the *De inventione dialectica* they have become the topics of his dialectical system, that is, topics as labels of the general features that things share (or do not share). The traditional universals such as genus and species thus become a subclass of a much wider group of common headings to be used in inventing arguments. These headings direct our view to what things have in common and in what they disagree, and at several places in his work we see Agricola arguing for careful observation of all aspects of things, which enables us to bring the phenomena under groups, general laws, general rules – important for the arts and sciences.

If dialectic, as Agricola says, is a system that enables us to find similarities between things, it is a small step to identify a universal with the group that has a particular feature in common, that is, to identify, e.g., the universal cathood with the class of individual cats ‘out there’: the focus now lies on the group of things that show particular similarities (and dissimilarities) rather than on a

21 *De inventione dialectica*, 9; cf. Mack, *Renaissance Argument*, 140. Agricola frequently says that things have their own nature, power and function, e.g. “nativa enim est quaedam omnibus adiacens vis” and “omniaque propositum sibi destinatumque finem” (*De inventione*, 64 and 79). Things behave in a predictable and regular way because they have a particular ontological structure.

22 Agricola, at one point, equates the order of things with the order of the categories: “at illa [homo and virtus] toto rerum ordine, hoc est, praedicamentis, sunt diducta” (*De inventione dialectica*, 154). Substance is called the “receptacle and foundation of every thing” (76); magnitude plays the role of subject for the other accidental categories, called “adiacentia” in Agricola’s system (76).

mysterious entity (cathood) that lies hidden in the individual cats and that somehow needs to be disclosed by analysis and abstraction. This final step of identifying the universal with a collection of individuals is a step that the sixteenth-century humanist Mario Nizolio took, but since he frequently refers not only to Valla and Agricola but also to Juan Luis Vives, we will first examine Vives's position before ending with Nizolio's.

Juan Luis Vives

Vives certainly has a place in the series of humanists here considered: he was much inspired by Valla and Agricola, and, as said, was often quoted by Nizolio. Vives was in particular indebted to Agricola's *De inventione dialectica*, not only for Agricola's treatment of the topics but also for his general view of knowledge and language. The two hang together of course. As Agricola writes:

For almost everyone speaks *probabiliter* on the subject which they have undertaken to teach. For there is not a great supply of things known to us which can be necessary and undoubted; and, if we believe the Academy, nothing at all. No one denies this about things which belong to life and to norms of behavior. Similarly, in what belongs to the knowledge of the nature of things, there is nothing which is not argued about and debated on all sides with great ingenuity.²³

The fact that so much cannot be known for certain gives only more weight to arguing *probabiliter*; one does not need to argue for something which is certain (as ancient rhetoricians and philosophers already tell us). This does not mean that Agricola was a skeptic, but only that, as Peter Mack rightly concluded, that "there are many subjects on which there is no certainty."²⁴ The same is true for Vives, who also stresses the limitations of human knowledge without becoming a skeptic.

²³ *De inventione dialectica*, 207; trans. Mack, *Renaissance Argument*, 179

²⁴ Mack, *Renaissance Argument*, 179: "Agricola was not a sceptic in the strict sense, in that, although he believed that most things are not certain, for him the *probabile* included the certain," referring to passages where Agricola includes certain arguments as part of the *probabile*. See also John Monfasani, "Lorenzo Valla and Rudolph Agricola," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 28 (1990): 181–99.

[W]hat knowledge we have gained can only be reckoned as probable and not assumed as absolutely true . . . The first precept in the contemplation and discussion of nature, is that since we cannot gain any certain knowledge from it, we must not indulge ourselves too much in examining and inquiring into those things which we can never attain, but that all our studies should be applied to the necessities of life, to some bodily or mental gain, to the cultivation and increase of reverence.²⁵

At various places in his work Vives makes clear that investigations of nature can never result in indubitable knowledge and absolute certainty but are always approximations, the quality of which depends on our data and our reasoning process. We should therefore collect as much data as possible and be wary of hasty generalizations: “from a number of separate experiments the mind gathered a universal law, which, after support and confirmation by many experiments was considered certain and established.”²⁶ These laws should always be checked against our data, also when we collect data from our reading:

in teaching the arts, we shall collect many experiments and observe the experience of many teachers, so that from them general rules may be formed. If some of the experiments do not agree with the rule, then the reason why this happens must be noted down. If there are more deviations than agreements or an equal number, a dogma must not be established from the fact, but the facts must be transmitted to the astonishment of posterity, so that from astonishment . . . philosophy may grow.²⁷

Thus the gap between the essential structure of the world and human knowledge can be bridged by employing the right methodology, so to speak. It is here that the topics, as laid out by Agricola, also become important for Vives. Since, as we have seen, the topics are labels or headings under which we are invited to view and discuss things, they become – so to speak – a bridge between the world and the human mind. It is the human mind that notices aspects that things have in common (e.g. essence, quality, cause, effect, and so on). In Vives’s account the topics are a reflection of the ontological order and as such

25 *De tradendis disciplinis* IV, 1, in Vives, *Opera omnia*, ed. Gregorio Myans y Siscar (8 vols., Valencia: In officina Benedicti Montfort, 1782–90; repr. London: Gregg, 1964), VI: 347–48; trans. Foster Watson, *Vives: On Education* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913; repr. Totowa NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1971), 166–67.

26 *De tradendis disciplinis* I, 2, in *Opera omnia* VI, 250; trans. Watson, *Vives*, 20.

27 *De tradendis disciplinis* II, 4, in *Opera omnia* VI, 296; trans. Watson, *Vives*, 87–88.

an instrument and heuristic aid for the human mind. They constitute a kind of grid through which we observe the world: they guide us in noticing similarities between things: the topic *cause* makes us looking for causes. This is of course very important for the ultimate goal: finding arguments. If we want to argue – to put it in the most elementary form – that A is B, we need to see what they have in common, finding a medium that connects what we already know and what is still in doubt.

There is an ambiguity in the use of topics, however, which Vives might have inherited from Agricola's account as well.²⁸ As universal aspects of things, the topics themselves are a kind of universals: indeed, the 'traditional' universals such as genus, species, property and difference are just a subgroup of the topics. So it is not surprising to find Vives saying that the "essential similitude is called a universal in the schools (*in schola*)."²⁹ Vives also makes clear that these similitudes exist in reality, independent of our thinking and linguistic expression (*extra nomina atque intelligentias nostras*) "since the similitude is in the things themselves, or rather the things themselves are similar and conforming to each other."³⁰ This similitude can be called a "nature, manner, reason, form, or sign (*natura seu conditio seu ratio seu forma seu nota*)" and "genus for wider groups and species for smaller more limited groups." On the other hand, similitude also refers to what these essences, unknown to the human mind, effect at the level of what *is* visible and knowable to the human mind, viz. sensible qualities and actions. The similarities are what things have in common, and these common features are ultimately caused by the inner essences. Thus, A and B can have something in common, e.g. both are yellow, but this universal is not to be identified with the topic *contingent* that has led the mind to look for common accidents in A and B. Similarly, the genus *animality* in a horse is not identical with the topic *genus* that has led the mind to look for the type of genus in that horse. Because of this ambiguity it proves therefore to be a small step from the essential aspects of things to the organizing principles of the human mind. As similitudes topics are called the essences of things while they also are the set of categories that organize the features we see.

While the use of topics is thus primarily directed at argumentation, the wider framework in which they have a place includes epistemology and

28 For this ambiguity in Agricola see Nauta, "From Universals to Topics," 212–13.

29 *De instrumento probabilitatis*, in *Opera omnia* III, 86.

30 *De explanatione cuiusque essentiae*, in *Opera omnia* III, 124: "... genus hoc aut species non modo in nominibus vel nostris intelligentiis est situm, sed in natura rerum est ea similitudo ac communio, etiam extra nomina atque intelligentias nostras; est enim in ipsis rebus seu potius res ipsae similes conformesque."

ontology. While Vives does not deny that essences exist, he shifts the attention away from these hidden entities to what we can observe of things. Such a move is also visible in his account of the soul, where he turns his attention from the metaphysical nature of the soul towards its phenomenological manifestations – something which earned him, quite anachronistically, the title of “father of modern psychology.”³¹ We can already see such a move away from substance and essence towards sensible qualities and actions in late-medieval thought.³² What is new in the fifteenth century is the way in which the topics are used to encourage the process of collecting and comparing data with a view to finding arguments.

This shift in focus makes it difficult to characterize Vives as a realist or a nominalist. Like his predecessor Agricola, Vives believes in an essential order – universals as “essential similitudes” – since otherwise concepts would be null and void if there would be nothing in extramental reality to correspond to those concepts. On the other hand, he also sounds very much like a nominalist when he writes that “there is no universal in the imagination nor in nature; but it is only attained through discursive reason (*ratione discurrente*) under a very confused and very thin image when the mind strips itself off, as best as it can, from the attributes of fantasy.”³³ This comes close to the position that we ascribed to Agricola above: Doghood is not a mysterious entity that is one and many at the same time – one thing because it is one and the same nature, but also many because it is instantiated in all individual dogs – but Doghood is a concept that is formed by the human mind, though with firm grounding in reality. Vives’s position comes close to the traditional account as formulated by Boethius, according to which universals exist both in particular things and as concepts in our minds. Since Boethius does not want to give up the Aristotelian principle that everything that exists is one in number, universals must be said to be particular as sensed in particular things – they might be identified with the ‘likenesses’ between things – but universal as grasped in thought. Both Agricola and Vives seem to accept a similar position, wavering

31 Foster Watson, “The Father of Modern Psychology,” *Psychological Review* 22 (1915): 333–53; G. Zilboorg, *A History of Medical Psychology* (New York: Norton, 1941), 194: “father of modern, empirical psychology; but the true forerunner of the dynamic psychology of the twentieth century.” Cited in Lorenzo Casini, *Cognitive and Moral Psychology in Renaissance Philosophy. A Study of Juan Luis Vives’ De anima et vita* (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2006), 12.

32 Robert Pasnau, *Metaphysical Themes, 1274–1671* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 634–35.

33 *De anima et vita* II, 1, in *Opera omnia* III, 344; cf. Casini, *Cognitive and Moral Psychology*, 22–23.

perhaps between conceptualism and realism (just as Scotus is said to have done).³⁴ But once the focus falls entirely on the human mind – governed by the topics as organizing principles of knowledge and argumentation – it might be tempting to identify the universals with just the collection of individuals that the human mind has formed on the basis of the similarities that it detects. This is a step Mario Nizolio was prepared to take, who indeed praised Agricola and Vives but also criticized them for their reluctance to give up their belief in universals.³⁵

Mario Nizolio

Famous in his own time for his *Thesaurus Ciceronianus*, which had already gone through more than fifty editions in the sixteenth century, Nizolio's philosophical work, entitled *On the true principles and the true manner of philosophizing against the pseudophilosophers* from 1553 was given serious attention only much later thanks to Leibniz's catholic philosophical interests. One of the assumptions in Nizolio's attack on scholastic philosophy is that the scholastics endorsed, almost tout court, a realist interpretation of the universals. With the exception of the nominalists almost all philosophers from the time of Plato and Aristotle onward believed, so Nizolio assumes, in the existence of universals in a way that, in his view, is fundamentally mistaken. He sees it therefore as his main task to attack the Aristotelian building by destroying its foundations, that is, universals – and, in their wake, other abstract notions such as transcendentals and the categories.³⁶

A first important step in his argument is to claim that universal terms such as 'animal', 'man' and so on, are really collective terms.³⁷ They are singular but that does not mean that they stand for a singular entity, animality or humanity. Philosophers have simply ignored the fact that in daily speech (and also in refined literate language), we often use figures of speech: singular for plural, part for whole, or one thing for a whole class (and vice versa):

34 Olivier Boulnois, "Réelles intentions: nature commune et universaux selon Duns Scot," *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* 1 (1992): 3–33, in particular 28–33.

35 Nizolio, *De veris principiis et vera ratione philosophandi contra pseudophilosophos*, ed. Quirinus Breen, 2 vols. (Rome: Fratelli Bocca, 1956), 1: 92.

36 For an extensive analysis see Nauta, "Anti-Essentialism and the Rhetoricization of Knowledge: Mario Nizolio's Humanist Attack on Universals," *Renaissance Quarterly* 65 (2012): 31–66.

37 Nizolio, *De veris principiis*, 1: 41–53.

For the names *man* and *animal* and other such words never signify a genus or a species or some common nature except when they are used and accepted figuratively. This [common] nature, which is signified by these figuratively used words, is nothing else but a multitude composed of individuals; and it is a certain discrete whole that truly consists of nothing else but singulars.³⁸

Nizolio thus wants terms to refer either to one singular or to a group as a whole – *singillatim aut universe sive in universum*. There is nothing in between: *animal* does not refer to a universal that is one and common at the same time. Universals are thus caused, Nizolio thinks, by a misunderstanding of language: a universal is nothing but the group of individuals: doghood is just the collection of individual dogs.³⁹

But now Nizolio faces a problem: for once we agree that that there are no universals, that is, no essences that divide reality at its joints (dogs, cats, trees, humans, etc.), is any categorization possible and as real as any other? Does anything go? Even for Nizolio it would be difficult to accept such a position. To group dogs with dogs makes infinitely more sense than to group dogs with maple trees or with gems. And yet, some examples give the impression that indeed we are quite flexible in grouping things together as long as we have found something that they all have in common. To quote an example that Nizolio himself gives: we can group human beings together with ants because they share the quality of taking precautions for the future. Whatever common trait we happen to notice among things is sufficient to form a group, a class. Such a position implies a deflation – or what we may call a de-ontologization – of the predicables: genus and species become no more than convenient labels for indicating groups and subgroups. We may of course group things into species and genus (man-animal), but ontologically speaking there are only individuals which we can categorize dependent on what we note as similarity. At times, Nizolio seems to recoil from holding such a position, speaking of the genus *animal* and the species *horse* in terms of an ‘essential’ relationship, just like the relationship between an apple and the color it happens to have at a particular

38 Ibid., I: 51.

39 Nizolio's account is hardly satisfactory. He suggests that *genus* and *army* are collective names in much the same way, which they are not. A genus-term such as “animal” is clearly different from “army” or “nation,” for while we can say “Socrates is a living being,” we cannot say “the soldier is the army.” Nizolio mentions the objection but has no good answer; see Nauta, “Anti-Essentialism and the Rhetoricization of Knowledge,” 42–43.

moment can be called an accidental relationship.⁴⁰ This terminology might seem problematic for a self-styled nominalist such as Nizolio, but he tries to explain ‘essential’ in purely extensional terms: there is no horse that is not an animal. In his edition of Nizolio’s work, Leibniz criticized this solution, arguing that the meaning of a concept is not the same as its extension: the meaning of the concept horse is not the same as the collection of individual horses. Even if there were no horses on earth, it would still be true to say that horse is a non-rational animal.⁴¹

The next step in Nizolio’s argument concerns the making of our categorizations. Are they just human inventions or do they have a grounding in reality? It is a bit of both for Nizolio. But given his claim that universals are just collections of individuals that the mind takes as one group, it is the role of the mind that takes center stage in Nizolio’s account: it is a creative, comprehensive act of the human mind that sees a group of individuals as group “simultaneously and all at once (*simul et semel*).” He calls it a “philosophical and oratorical act,” by which he means an act of comparing things and seeing the similarities between them.⁴² It is a philosophical act, since it plays an important role in philosophy, where definitions are based on similarities between things. It is an “oratorical act” because we find the trope of using the singular instead of the plural – or part instead of the whole, or one thing instead of a plurality or the entire group – often used not only by orators, poets, and prose writers, but also by common people (*populus, vulgus*). It is what rhetoricians call *intellectio*, or synecdoche.⁴³ For Nizolio synecdoche is the linguistic expression of *comprehensio*: when we take a group together we use a word that, because of its singular case (e.g. dog), might suggest that it refers to a single thing (the universal Doghood), while in fact it refers to just all the individuals taken together (Bello, Fido, Brownie, Snoopie, etc.).⁴⁴

Because Nizolio has equated universals with just groups of things ‘out there,’ he can now claim that his account has reestablished a direct contact between the human mind and the world of concrete things. Having rejected universals as nonsensical entities – *ficta* of the philosophers – Nizolio claims that his universals constitute reality itself (that is, collections of individuals grouped together): they are made by nature (*a natura facta*).⁴⁵ There are of course also

40 Ibid., 1: 140–41; cf. 122 and 139.

41 Leibniz in Nizolio, *De veris principiis*, 1: 87 n. 5.

42 Nizolio, *De veris principiis*, 2: 80.

43 Ibid., 1: 41 and 46, referring to Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 8.6.19–20.

44 Ibid., 2: 80; Cicero, *De oratore* 3.27.106 and 2.31.135, quoted by Nizolio, 1: 74.

45 Ibid., 1: 78.

a number of unsolved problems in Nizolio's account but we now have a rough idea of his attempt to replace the doctrine of universals and abstraction of those universals by an extensional approach in which classes are groups of individuals grasped by the mind.

Since Nizolio only perfunctorily refers once or twice to the *nominales*,⁴⁶ the question arises: how nominalistic is his project? His final objective is certainly not nominalistic at all: the rejection of universals is aimed at putting dialectic and metaphysics in their place and restoring rhetoric to its proper place as the queen of arts. Nizolio's ardent defense of the Ciceronian union of reason and eloquence, and of philosophy and rhetoric, finds of course no equivalent in nominalism.⁴⁷ But even on a more detailed level, it is difficult to see structural similarities. While for Nizolio universals are out there (as groups of things), for Ockham universals are singular concepts in our mind, that is, singular entities that can stand for many things. The whole notion of mental language that is so important for Ockham is completely absent from Nizolio's account. Even though Nizolio's notion of a mental act by which the human mind sees a group of individuals might remind us of Ockham's theory of the universal as a particular act of the mind, the context and development of the idea is wholly different. Nizolio does not show any awareness that this act-theory of Ockham requires an abstractionist account of knowledge. On Ockham's account the concept cat is produced in our mind when we see a cat: this concept can then be used to stand for all objects that we meet and that resemble it.⁴⁸ Though it is a particular act of the mind it can stand universally for all its referents, by virtue of its resemblance to each of them. As already indicated, Nizolio does not develop such an abstractionist account of knowledge, placing instead universals outside the mind: they are the genera out there, comprehensively understood by the human mind.⁴⁹

46 Ibid., I: 65 and 82.

47 Nizolio cites various passages from Cicero's *De oratore*, drawing, without doubt, on his own *Observationes in M.T. Ciceronem*; cf. Matthias Wesseler, *Die Einheit von Wort und Sache. Der Entwurf einer rhetorischen Philosophie bei Marius Nizolius* (Munich: W. Fink, 1974), 27–29; Erika Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 175.

48 William of Ockham, *Summa logicae*, ed. Philotheus Boehner et al. (St. Bonaventure NY: Franciscan Institute, 1974), 57–65.

49 Nizolio's notion of *comprehensio* is different from Ockham's notion of intuitive cognition. Intuitive cognition gives us direct and correct information about the existence of an object, while Nizolio's *comprehensio*, as we have seen, is a mental act by which we grasp individual things as a group.

Concluding Remarks

My discussion has confirmed an obvious point, that it is almost impossible to say anything in general about the influence of nominalism on humanism. As was said in the introduction, the labels are too general and too vague. If we define humanism in terms of the *studia humanitatis*, a direct influence of nominalist teaching on humanism is of course not to be expected. From the time of Petrarch onwards the whole point of the program of the *studia humanitatis* was to get away from the 'barbari Brittani' and their logical studies. Logic should be replaced by rhetoric, or at least be subordinated to it, and such a subordinate role for logic was, as is well known, defended by Valla and by Nizolio; the latter redefined logic in 'true' and 'false logic' of which the former was then equated with rhetoric.⁵⁰ Agricola, and to some extent Vives, aimed at a transformation of the three arts of the *trivium* into one system of thinking and arguing. The aims, approach as well as the tone in which these ideas were presented could vary considerably among humanists, but the least we can say is that such attempts to reinstate rhetoric (or a rhetorical-dialectical system) at the heart of the *trivium* would hardly be congenial to an Ockhamist.

This is of course not to say that some humanists could not have found inspiration in nominalist writings, especially in Northern Europe. An argument has been made for Melanchthon's debt to nominalism, though recent scholars have questioned this interpretation, pointing to aspects of his thinking, such as the notion of *lumen naturale* and the existence of innate ideas that seem to square oddly with a nominalist point of view.⁵¹ Similar remarks could be made about Wessel Gansfort and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, but the evidence is often tenuous and controversial, and again it all depends on what one understands by nominalism and whether we have in mind theology and moral philosophy or logic.⁵² In the case of the four humanists examined in this article it is difficult

50 Nizolio, *De veris principiis*, 2: 91; cf. Nauta, "Anti-Essentialism and the Rhetoricization of Knowledge," 55. Valla, *Dialectical Disputations*, II, proemium, ed. and trans. Copenhaver and Nauta, vol. 2: 2–6. Agricola, *De inventione dialectica*, on which see Mack, *Renaissance Argument*, and Vives, esp. *De instrumento probabilitatis* (*Opera omnia* III), *De ratione dicendi* and *De consultatione* (both in *OO* II).

51 Günter Frank, *Die theologische Philosophie Philipp Melanchthons (1497–1560)* (Leipzig: Benno, 1995), 33–37; Kees G. Meerhoff, "Philippe Melanchthon aux Pays-Bas et en France: quelques sondages," in *Melanchthon und Europa*, 2. Teilband. *Westeuropa*, eds. Günter Frank and Kees Meerhoff (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog 2002), 163–93.

52 Henk A.G. Braakhuis, "Wessel Gansfort between Albertism and Nominalism," in *Wessel Gansfort, 1419–1489, and Northern Humanism*, ed. Fokke Akkerman et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 30–43. On Lefèvre d'Étaples, who according to his student Beatus Rhenanus was

to see a close connection between their humanist program and nominalism. As we have seen, Valla turns out not to be an Ockhamist and at essential points his approach differs fundamentally from Ockham's. Agricola was a realist finding inspiration in Boethius and Duns Scotus rather than Ockham. Vives sounds like a nominalist and a realist at the same time, perhaps in the final analysis coming close to the traditional position of Boethius' conceptualism. Only Nizolio explicitly refers to the *nominales*, but apart from the rejection of the universals, the context and development of that rejection are wholly different. For all these humanists, the main sources were Cicero, Quintilian and Boethius rather than nominalist authors from the late-scholastic period. Nizolio, for instance, worked in a wholly different intellectual milieu in which Ciceronianism was the main issue.⁵³

What has probably contributed to the association of humanism with nominalism is an old interpretation of nominalism that has been criticized by recent scholarship but which is still rather influential, namely nominalism as a critical movement that undermined faith in the foundations of Aristotelian-scholastic philosophy and theology, thereby contributing to the Reformation and also, because of its alleged empiricism, to the rise of a new scientific culture.⁵⁴ These features of criticism, skepticism, empiricism and a pre-Reformation mentality have long been ascribed to humanism too, even though here too it seems that the outcome – the emergence of a 'modern,' scientific, secularized culture – has been projected onto these earlier traditions on the principle of *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*. From such a perspective humanists then appear as brothers-in-arms (and a few sisters) with nominalists, and hence the association in the minds of not a few historians.

Although it seems that this whole interpretation must be considered wishful thinking – a piece of Whiggish historiography – there is one aspect that would certainly find favor with nominalists. In the humanists here considered we see a move towards a de-essentialization of universals and abstract entities, that is, a move away from universals as such and away from the process of abstraction by which universals as essences are to be dug up. The final result is

positive about nominalism, see Cesare Vasoli, *La dialettica e la retorica dell'Umanesimo. "Invention" e "Metodo" nella cultura del XV e XVI secolo* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1968), 187–88; but cf. Stanislas Musial, "Beatus Rhenanus étudiant de philosophie à Paris (1503–1507)," *Annuaire de la société des amis de la Bibliothèque de Sélestat*, 35 (1985): 275 (skeptical). For another example see the contribution by Copenhaver and Ward in this volume.

53 See Breen's introduction to his Nizolio edition.

54 Courtenay, *Ockham and Ockhamism*, 1–19 ("In Search of Nominalism: Two Centuries of Historical Debate").

a horizontal ontology in which concrete things, grouped in classes on the basis of what we empirically observe, take center stage, rather than hierarchies of universals such as genus and species somehow residing in, though never identical with, individual things. These humanists were certainly not alone nor the first to warn against reification and hypostatization, but equipped with their linguistic and rhetorical training they could argue that such reification and hence a belief in abstract entities was caused by a misunderstanding of the Latin language. Of course, this belief was an article of faith, but as most articles of faith it had its consequences in how the world was viewed. The humanists thus believed that once we have got rid of the metaphysical superstructure of universals, essences, categories, transcendentals and so on, we can look at the world directly and describe it in the common language of good Latin, either because this language had its intrinsic qualities to do so (as Valla's argument implies) or because we simply need a lingua franca for scholarship, science and learned communication (as Vives argued). This is of course not to say that these humanists were empiricists or that they were engaged in a natural philosophical program that focused on the world of concrete things – even though we find glowing pleas for concrete observation of all kinds of phenomena. Agricola, for instance, writes to a friend that he must “reach out to the things themselves (*res ipsas*),” examining “the geography and nature of lands, seas, mountains and rivers; the customs, borders and circumstances of nations that live on earth; the empires in their historical or extended forms (...); the medicinal properties of trees and herbs.”⁵⁵ Similar statements can be found in his *De inventione dialectica* and also in the works of Vives and other humanists. This might not be a direct result of a move away from universals and abstraction, but on the other hand it is not too far-fetched to see these as two sides of the same coin. In a way the critique of what the humanists regarded as the theoretical and unduly abstract terminology and notions of the scholastics could only lead to a plea for the examination of the world as we see it, and think and talk about it, following the *intellectus communis* and the *sensus communis*, expressions that, not incidentally, abound in their works.

55 Agricola, *Letters*, ed. Adrie van der Laan and Fokke Akkerman (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2002), letter no. 38, p. 207 (their translation slightly adapted).

The Quest for Certainty in Fact and Faith

Pierre-Daniel Huet and Josephus' Testimonium Flavianum

April G. Shelford

For if the History of Jesus-Christ be not true, then are all Consequences drawn from thence vain and frivolous. But if it be true that he said and did what the Evangelists record of him, then are all my foregoing Conclusions strong.

WILLIAM POPPLE



Introduction

In 1679, the English scholar Edward Bernard (1638–1696) wrote his French colleague Pierre-Daniel Huet (1630–1721) with exciting news: he was going to prepare a complete and emended edition of the works of the Jewish historian, Josephus (37–c.100). Huet greeted the plan enthusiastically. It was, he wrote Bernard, an enormous undertaking, but one worthy of his stellar erudition. For a long time, his friend, the Leiden Professor Etienne Le Moyne (1624–1689), had endeavored to complete a similar project. Now that Bernard was devoting his industry and abilities to Josephus, men of letters could hope for a perfected edition of works available until then only in corrupt versions. Huet assured

* I would never have become an intellectual historian, much less entered the fascinating and contentious world of late humanist erudition, if John Monfasani had not pulled me aside more than twenty years ago after a night class to suggest that I pursue graduate study in history. Throughout my Master's program, he inspired and challenged me with his erudition and his rigor, and he wisely suggested *le grand siècle* as a congenial intellectual home for me. He has had an equally profound influence on me as a teacher – indeed, I frequently find myself admonishing my students as he did me many years ago: “Never think you’re smarter than your subjects!” This was particularly good advice as I prepared the dissertation on which this article is based and which Anthony Grafton so generously guided from thesis to monograph.

Bernard that he would be unstinting in any assistance he could provide.¹ Huet subsequently reiterated his praise of the labor and the laborer and followed through on his offer of help by collating information from manuscripts in the royal library.² Over the years, Bernard's persistence in his task became a scholarly jest in England: "Savilian *Bernard*, a good Learned man/Will give us his *Josephus* when he can."³ Indeed, the project was still incomplete when Huet wrote another encouraging letter – this time in 1696, the same year Bernard died.⁴

Enthusiasm for the works of Josephus was not new, nor was it limited to *érudits*. Born just a few years after the Crucifixion, Josephus, "the Jewish historian and honest traitor,"⁵ was a well-educated member of a prosperous Jerusalem family. He served as a military leader during the Jewish revolt, and he adeptly navigated the political complexities of the uprising, which climaxed in the destruction of Jerusalem in CE 70. Josephus not only survived, but thrived, first as a captive, then as an honored guest of the Emperor Vespasian, whose accession to the imperium he prophesied. Enjoying patronage at the highest levels of society in Rome, it was there that he wrote his histories, the *Antiquities* and the *War of the Jews*.⁶ Almost immediately, Christian writers embraced Josephus' histories as authoritative sources on Judaism and for a historical narrative that could serve Christian apologetic ends.⁷ Josephus' histories were also a treasure trove of primary sources, and his works were translated, wholly or in part, into Latin, Syriac, and Armenian, and abridgments and paraphrases also became popular in various Christian regions.

During the seventeenth century, the highly learned and the merely literate held Josephus in high regard. Joseph Scaliger judged him "the most diligent

1 Huet to Bernard, v Cal May 1679, Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 11432, fols. 217–18.

2 Huet to Bernard, xv Cal May 1679, *ibid.*, fols. 230–31; and v Cal Feb 1680, *ibid.*, fols. 269–70.

3 Quoting Clement Barksdale's "Authors and Books" (1685), Hugh de Quehen, "Bernard, Edward (1638–1697)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxyau.wrlc.org/view/article/2240, accessed 6 Jan 2012]).

4 Huet to Bernard, viii Cal Non. 1696, Paris, BnF MS Lat. 11433, fols. 511–12. Bernard's version of the first four books and part of the fifth book of the *Antiquities* was published at Oxford in 1700.

5 Anthony Grafton, *Forgers and Critics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 106.

6 On Josephus' life, see Mireille Hadas-Lebel, *Flavius Josephus: Eyewitness to Rome's First-Century Conquest of Judea* (New York: Macmillan, 1993).

7 See Heinz Schreckenberg, "The Works of Josephus and the Early Christian Church," in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, eds. Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata (Detroit MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 315–24.

of authors and the greatest lover of truth known." Madame de Sevigné, the celebrated salon lioness, once chastized a friend for not finishing a history she considered beautiful, grand, and magnificent.⁸ Josephus' works had long been regarded as a sort of 'fifth Gospel,' and complete collections appeared in multiple vernacular editions throughout the century in England, France, and Germany.⁹ In 1667, the Jansenist Robert Arnauld d'Andilly, elder brother of the more famous Antoine, launched yet another translation in France, which was reprinted in a variety of formats more than a dozen times in the next hundred years. Josephus' powers as a historian exceeded even those of Tacitus, d'Andilly asserted, and he offered readers heroes, both male and female, who surpassed those of the pagans and who exemplified virtues to imitate and vices to abominate. Only the most hard-hearted of *les petits* and *les grands* could fail to profit from reading a work so "capable of impressing upon us respect for the Divine Majesty through the sight of so many effects of his infinite power and his adorable conduct."¹⁰

But Josephus' texts had not survived time and the copyists unscathed; however much desired, their restoration had been the graveyard of the ambitions of many an *érudit*, which Huet described in "On the Authority of Josephus" in the *Huetiana* (1722).¹¹ Alas, without a definitive edition of Josephus, the less prudent or respectful questioned what Huet and many others considered a supremely credible and authoritative source – a problem Huet knew all too well from his own experience. Decades earlier he had to engage closely with unsettling questions about Josephus' texts because the *Testimonium Flavianum*, a famous account of Jesus' life found in the *Antiquities*, figured importantly in his *Demonstratio evangelica* (1679) – indeed, it was evidence he could scarcely do without. Yet before he could deploy that evidence in a complex proof of the truth of the Christian religion, he had to defend the passage's authenticity, which an increasing number of reputable scholars had come to doubt.

While the debate over the *Testimonium Flavianum*'s authenticity is well known (and is ongoing), Huet's contribution has received little scholarly

8 Hadas-Lebel, *Josephus*, 228, and "La lecture de Flavius Josèphe aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles," in *La République des Lettres et l'histoire du Judaïsme antique: XVI^e–XVIII^e siècles*, eds. Chantal Grell and François Laplanche (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1992), 101–13 at 104.

9 Hadas-Lebel, "La lecture," 101–113, esp n 2, and 102 for French editions; Peter Burke, "A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians," *History and Theory* 5, 2 (1966): 135–52.

10 D'Andilly, *Histoire de la Guerre*, fols. *3, *5, *6av–r. Unless otherwise indicated, translations from the French are mine.

11 *Huetiana* (Paris, 1722), xxxviii.

attention.¹² This is a pity as Huet's contribution has intrinsic interest. Coming from a prominent member of the Republic of Letters, it also figures in a fascinating episode of the Republic's querulous history. Most important for my argument here, it illuminates how the intellectual tools of the textual critic continued to sap (if inadvertently) the authority of texts, including the Bible, deemed central to religious belief while Cartesians simultaneously challenged the ability of humanist scholarship to deliver 'certainty,' particularly in historical matters.¹³

Huet's defense of the *Testimonium Flavianum* gives us a superb perch to observe this epistemological 'perfect storm.' I argued in an earlier work how the *Demonstratio*'s preface featured an important theoretical response to the Cartesian challenge to the certainty of truths obtained through historical scholarship compared with those acquired through deductive reasoning.¹⁴ My focus here is examining what I will call Huet's 'geometrico-historical' method, which he subsequently proposed and employed in the *Demonstratio*. The debate over the *Testimonium Flavianum*'s authenticity permits a narrowing of focus in a sprawling, very complex work, serving to test that method's success. The fact is, in the context of contemporary arguments, Huet argued intelligently for the *Testimonium Flavianum*'s authenticity. But paradoxically that 'success' fatally undercut his method. Indeed, this larger failure to prove the worth of his method abundantly supports Anthony Grafton's assertion

-
- 12 For an excellent survey of the question, see Alice Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy from Late Antiquity to Modern Times* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003). That said, she does not treat Huet's arguments in much depth, which is surprising as his defense bolsters one of her chief points, that is, the weakness of the challengers' case; nor does she consider Huet's contribution as I do here, that is, in the context of the 'geometrico-historical' proof he was developing. Whealey, 135–38. Also see Serge Bardet, *Le Testimonium Flavianum: Examen historique, considérations historiographiques* (Paris: Cerf, 2002); J. Neville Birdsall, "The Continuing Enigma of Josephus's Testimony about Jesus," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 67, 2 (Spring 1985): 609–22; Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 679–703.
 - 13 See, for example, Joseph M. Levine, "Erasmus and the Problem of the Johannine Comma," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 58, 4 (1997): 573–96. Particularly relevant in Huet's period were the controversies sparked by Richard Simon's *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (1678), which worried Huet a good deal (see below).
 - 14 April G. Shelford, "Thinking Geometrically in the *Demonstratio evangelica* (1679)," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 63, 4 (2002): 599–617. At the conclusion, I alluded briefly to Huet's defense of the *Testimonium*; in *Transforming the Republic of Letters: Pierre-Daniel Huet and European Intellectual Life, 1650–1730* (Rochester NY: University of Rochester Press, 2007), I alluded to the role that Christophe Sandius (see below) played in it (157).

that “Pierre Bayle . . . and his fellow footnoters responded to Descartes more cleverly and constructively” than Huet.¹⁵ It is not surprising, then, that Huet’s method had no *fortuna*, nor that it has attracted little scholarly interest – in marked contrast, for example, to his argument that all pagan deities had their origins in Moses and his family.¹⁶ Yet Huet’s failure is instructive. It enables us to sort out the intertwined destinies of historical, religious, and philosophical studies as buffeted by Cartesian, then Spinozan critiques, and to perceive clearly the stakes in the debates they prompted.¹⁷ “Questions of historical truth still hinged most essentially on ecclesiastical tradition,” and, though Huet’s *Demonstratio* does not figure in that century’s “great historical enterprises,” it nevertheless deserves attention for how it so unflinchingly sought to engage Cartesianism on its own turf.¹⁸ To appreciate all these points, however, I must

-
- 15 Anthony Grafton, “The Footnote from De Thou to Ranke,” *History and Theory* 33, 4 (1994), 74–75.
 - 16 In this, Huet followed in the footsteps of his old Huguenot teacher, Samuel Bochart. Monod writes that Huet brought to the task “un esprit d’une érudition immense et d’une médiocre prépondération.” Albert Monod, *De Pascal à Chateaubriand: Les défenseurs français du Christianisme de 1670 à 1802* (1916; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970), 87. On this scholarly tradition and Huet’s place in it, see Alphonse Dupront, *Pierre-Daniel Huet et l’exégèse comparatiste au XVII^e siècle* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1930); Don Cameron Allen, *Mysteriously Meant* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1970); D.P. Walker, *The Ancient Theology* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1972); Christopher R. Ligota, “Der apologetische Rahmen der Mythendeutung im Frankreich des 17. Jahrhunderts (P.-D. Huet),” in *Mythographie der frühen Neuzeit. Ihre Anwendung in den Künsten* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1984), 149–61; Alain Niderst, “Comparatisme et syncrétisme religieux de Huet,” in *Pierre-Daniel Huet (1630–1721)*, ed. Suzanne Guellouz (Paris, Seattle, and Tübingen: Biblio 17, 1994), 75–82. Jonathan Israel emphasizes this aspect of the *Demonstratio* in *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 453–55.
 - 17 And which Blandine Barret-Kriegel describes so well – indeed, her discussion of the genesis of Mabillon’s *De re diplomatica* (1681) provides a useful contrast to Huet’s project in the *Demonstratio*: Blandine Barret-Kriegel, *La défaite de l’érudition* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1988), 145–75. For the larger French context of Huet’s apologetic, see Monod, *De Pascal à Chateaubriand*; François Laplanche, *L’évidence du Dieu chrétien: Religion, culture et société dans l’apologétique protestante de la France classique (1576–1670)* (Paris: CNRS, 1983). Monod discusses Huet at 83–90. J.G.A. Pocock has explored the continuing vitality of the critical tradition even in the self-proclaimed Enlightenment age of philosophical history in *Barbarism and Religion*, especially the first volume, *The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon, 1737–1764* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
 - 18 Donald R. Kelley, *Faces of History: Historical Inquiry from Herodotus to Herder* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 208.

first briefly situate Huet in the intellectual world of the late seventeenth century; describe the *Demonstratio*'s origins, its targets, the structure of its argument, and the place of the *Testimonium* in it; and summarize the status of the debate over its authenticity.

The Context

The origins of the *Demonstratio evangelica* was a testy exchange between an ambitious young man of promising, if untested intellectual ability, and the celebrated Jewish scholar Menasseh Ben Israel (1604–1657) in the synagogue in Amsterdam.¹⁹ Undertaken in the early 1650s, Huet's *peregrinatio academica* was the only time he ventured outside of France, and the opportunities it presented for meetings with well-known scholars in Sweden, German lands, and the Netherlands launched his reputation in the Republic of Letters. Son of a Huguenot convert to Catholicism, Huet had already drawn the approving attention of scholars, Huguenot and Catholic, in his native Caen. According to Huet's account in the *Demonstratio*, he debated Jewish and Christian doctrines for three days with Ben Israel when that "most learned of the Jews, . . . previously known to me for his fame and erudite writings," criticized Christian apologists for exegetical incompetence. Huet retorted that it was the Jews who twisted the meaning of Scripture. Moreover, Christians could adequately defend their religion with just one of the many arguments traditionally deployed against the Jews: the completion in the New Testament of the Old Testament prophecies. He himself would show that it was not only the most clear, certain, and secure proof of Christian truth, but that it possessed the same degree of certainty as a geometric proof.

Ben Israel was long dead by the time Huet fulfilled his promise with the *Demonstratio evangelica*. In the meantime, he established his credibility as a scholar with a massive commentary on Origen and a short treatise on transla-

19 Huet described the meeting in the *Demonstratio*, Praefatio.II, and in his autobiography, *Commentarius de rebus ad eum pertinentibus* (1718), whose translation by Charles Nisard has been reprinted as *Mémoires*, ed. Joseph-Phillipe Salazar (Toulouse: Société de littératures classiques, 1993). As there were several editions of the *Demonstratio*, I use Huet's subdivisions, though I drew upon the 1680 Dutch edition when preparing this discussion. On Menasseh Ben Israel and his influence, David S. Katz, "Menasseh ben Israel and Queen Christina," *Jewish Social Studies*, 45 (1983): 57–72; and Moshe Idel, "Kabbalah, Platonism and Prisca Theologia: The Case of Menasseh Ben Israel," in *Menasseh ben Israel and His World*, eds. Yosef Kaplan, Richard Henry Popkin, and Henry Méchoulan (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 201–19.

tion; his reputation as a neo-Latin poet and commentator on current literary matters; and his competence in science, particularly in anatomy.²⁰ Building out from schoolboy contacts in Caen, particularly with his Jesuit instructors, he created an intellectual network that included *salonnières* in Paris, professors at Dutch universities, and natural philosophers in the Royal Society of England. A participant in several intellectual circles in his home town and in Paris and co-founder of a scientific academy in the former, he was very well connected; he counted among his friends Jean Chapelain, the 'manager' of royal literary patronage, Madame de Lafayette, the novelist, and René Rapin, the neo-Latin poet and literary critic. It is an indication of his increasing social and intellectual capital that he was named assistant preceptor to the Dauphin in 1670. As such, he became editor of the *Ad usum Delphini*, and he dedicated the *Demonstratio* to his exalted, if unenthusiastic, pupil.

The road from provincial to Parisian érudit was marked by significant intellectual shifts as well as increasing affluence and rising status. When Huet made his promise to Ben Israel, he was probably still under the spell of Cartesianism as were many young intellectuals of his generation.²¹ Huet's words confirm his early enthusiasm for geometrical study and probably echo Descartes' privileging of geometry, too. By the time he wrote the *Demonstratio*, though, Huet had long since become disenchanted with the new philosophy. Thus, the original formulation of his project acquired rather more complex meanings and gave the work's preface its distinctly anti-Cartesian cast.

There were many reasons why Huet rejected Cartesianism, but most relevant here was its challenge to the prestige of humanist scholarship and to the value of historical study. Descartes severely criticized intellectual disciplines other than mathematics, clearly implying that only a deductively structured intellectual process could produce certain knowledge or '*science*'. Thus physics and chemistry, optics and astronomy could become sciences, while history could never be more than opinion, however well founded. The utility of the former over the latter was just as indisputable. History was one of those "simple forms of knowledge which can be acquired without the aid of reasoning."

20 *Origenis in Sacras Scripturas commentaria* (Rouen, 1668); *De interpretatione libri duo* (Paris, 1661); *Lettre de Monsieur Huet à Monsieur de Segrain sur l'origine des romans* (1674). Huet's neo-Latin poetry, some of which was published as *feuilles volantes*, circulated among friends before being first anthologized by his friend Georg Graevius in *Poemata latina et graeca* (Utrecht, 1694). Huet never published on science per se, though his correspondence provides much information on his activities. See David Lux, *Patronage and Royal Science in Seventeenth-Century France* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1989); Shelford, *Transforming*, chapter 4.

21 Robert S. Westman called this the 'Cartesian syndrome' in "Huygens and the Problem of Cartesianism," *Studies on Christiaan Huygens* (Liss: Swets and Zeitlinger, 1980), 83–103.

Time spent acquiring such knowledge was time wasted, because “it is no more the duty of an ordinary well-disposed man to know Latin and Greek than it is to know the languages of Switzerland or Brittany; or that the history of the Empire should be known any more than that of the smallest state in Europe.”²² Religious knowledge, for Descartes, fell into an entirely different category. Because religion was based on revealed truths “quite above our intelligence,” it had to be excluded from rationalistic prying.²³ Descartes’ followers continued his challenge to traditional letters and erudition, which took particularly irksome forms for Huet in the works of such Jansenists as Antoine Arnauld, both his *Nouveaux élémens de géométrie* (1664) and *L’art de penser, ou la logique de Port Royal* (1662), co-authored with Pierre Nicole.²⁴

In the preface to the *Demonstratio*, Huet took issue with the Cartesians on all these scores: First, though he believed that Christian faith did not require rational support, he also believed it to be a reasonable religion, thus rejected the notion that religious truths could not be proven demonstratively. Second, he simultaneously sought to diminish the degree of certainty that Cartesians believed geometric proofs possessed while augmenting the degree of certainty that one could expect of historical proofs.²⁵ In the Port Royal logic, for example, Arnauld and Nicole did not deny that assertions about the past made on the basis of texts regarded as credible and authentic possessed some degree of certainty or ‘moral’ certainty. But such reasoning was neither deductive, nor was it possible to determine precisely what degree of certainty it possessed. In other words, they assumed what Steven Shapin termed the ‘prudential maxims

22 René Descartes, *The Search After Truth by the Light of Nature*, in *The Philosophical Works of Descartes*, 1, trans. Elizabeth S. Haldane and G.R.T. Ross (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 309.

23 Descartes, *Discourse on Method*, in *ibid.*, 85.

24 I discuss the evidence of Huet’s reactions to Arnauld and Nicole in “Thinking Geometrically.”

25 Huet’s anti-cartesianism has been known for a long time, of course, though it has been explored mostly with respect to his self-consciously ‘philosophical’ works and in relation to his skepticism. See, for example, Francisque Bouillier, *Histoire de la philosophie cartésienne* (Paris: Delagrave, 1868), which remains useful, though it is very polemical; Tad M. Schmaltz, *Radical Cartesianism: The French Reception of Descartes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Thomas M. Lennon’s translation of Huet’s *Censura philosophiae cartesianae* (1689) (*Against Cartesian Philosophy* [New York: Humanity Books, 2003]) and *The Plain Truth: Descartes, Huet, and Skepticism* (Leiden: Brill, 2008). For an able review of how anti-Cartesians like Huet are receiving more scholarly attention these days, see Eric P. Lewis, “Cartesianism Revisited,” *Perspectives on Science* 15, 4 (2007): 493–522. An important exception to this generalization is Elena Rapetti, *Pierre-Daniel Huet: erudizione, filosofia, apologetica* (Milan: Vita et Pensiero, 1999).

of testimony,' that is, the bases on which any reasonable seventeenth-century person could "discern testimony that might be safely relied upon to build one's knowledge and to conduct one's affairs."²⁶

After his theoretical assault on the Cartesians, Huet created his geometrico-historical method. Simplistically put, he transformed maxims into definitions, propositions, and axioms, all of which were allegedly so clear and evident in and of themselves as not to require proof. They could then serve as the foundation for a geometrically structured version of the ancient defense of Christian truth, that is, the accomplishment in the New Testament of the Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament. Arnauld and Nicole accepted, for example, that we should always accept as the true author of a text the person to whom it had long been attributed, though with the proviso that one could never be sure. This was wholly unexceptional. The Protestant apologist Hugo Grotius appealed to precisely the same principle in his popular apologetic, *De veritate religionis Christianae* (1627), which was republished frequently in vernacular editions. In arguing his case for the authorship of the New Testament books, he wrote: "The Writings, about which there is no Dispute amongst Christians, and which have any particular Person's Name affixed to them are that Author's, whose Title they are marked with."²⁷ In Huet's geometrical proof, this maxim became his first definition, "An authentic book is one that was written by that author by whom it was said to have been written, and around that time when it is said that it was written."²⁸

26 Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 211. These were: plausibility; number of sources; lack of external and internal contradiction; the proximity of the testimony to the matter reported (thus, the superiority of eye-witness reports); knowledgeability and/or competence of the source; style of presentation/moral posture of the source; and the source's reputation for truth-telling, sanity, and/or lack of desire to misrepresent. Shapin also notes the use of these criteria by English Christian apologists at 225–27.

27 Hugo Grotius, *The Truth of the Christian Religion* (London, 1800), 143.

28 Its relevance to seventeenth-century challenges to Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch – most importantly, those of Spinoza – is obvious, and Huet devoted a substantial chunk of the *Demonstratio* to refuting him (see especially *Demonstratio evangelica* IV.14). It is unknown how Huet obtained a copy of the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, which was banned in the Netherlands in 1673. Vernière speculates that Christiaan Huygens, who knew Huet, might have brought it to Paris, but that it was more likely Leibniz, who was in Paris after 1672, who informed Huet of the treatise's contents. Vernière also lays out in parallel columns the locations in the *Tractatus* to which Huet responded: Paul Vernière, *Spinoza et la pensée française avant la Révolution* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France,

A plan of the *Demonstratio* (see Figure 1 at end of article) permits us to grasp Huet's argument in its entirety as well as to locate his defense of the *Testimonium Flavianum* in it. The argument of prophecy-fulfillment was inherently historical: this was prophesied at one point in time; it came to pass later. If one were a devout Christian, one needed no further confirmation of the truth of this process than the sacred texts that showed it unfolding through time, that is, the Old and New Testaments. But Huet wanted to create a *demonstrative* historical proof, so he set himself the task of *proving* that we could know the truths of religion as certainly as we know that a triangle has three sides, or that $2+2=4$. His proof that the prophecies had truly been fulfilled thus depended on proving that the Old and New Testaments were *authentic* historical works containing accounts of events that had *really* happened. Huet never doubted that the Bible was a divinely revealed and supremely sacred text, of course, but it had to be a reliable and accurate history, too.

Huet followed a parallel procedure for each Testament: first, he established the authenticity of each book, then the factual truth of their contents. Along the way, he had to prove the proposition that "[t]he histories written in the New Testament are true." In order for that proposition to be true, it had to satisfy the conditions of Definition III and Axiom II: "A history is a narrative of things that occurred in that very time about which that history is written," and "[e]very history is true, which narrates events in the same way they are narrated in many contemporary books or books nearly contemporaneous with the period of the events." Once he accomplished this admittedly herculean task, he could correlate each and every Old Testament prophecy with its fulfillment

1954), 1: 108, 129–35. On Descartes' and Spinoza's impact on biblical exegesis, see Richard Popkin, "Cartesianism and Biblical Criticism," in *Problems in Cartesianism*, Thomas M. Lennon and John M. Nicholas, eds. (Montreal: McGill-Queens University, 1982), 61–81; Israel, *Radical Enlightenment*, 197–205; Jacqueline Lagrée, "Louis Meyer et la *Philosophia S. Scripturae interpres*. Projet cartésien, horizon spinoziste," *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 71, 1 (1987): 31–43, and "Louis Meyer et Spinoza devant la lecture de la Bible," *Bulletin de l'Association des Amis de Spinoza* 81 (1988): 1–9. It was once suggested to me that Huet imitated Spinoza when he laid out the *Demonstratio* as a geometric proof, but this is highly unlikely. It took a few years before the influence of the *Ethics* (1677) was felt in France: see Vernière, *Spinoza*, 1: 23. Huet does not appear to have known much about it, though that did not stop him from vociferously condemning it when Christophe Sandius (see below) dared to say anything good about Spinoza and his work. See their correspondence in Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, MS Ashburnham 1866, 2166, 2167, 2870. And why would Huet imitate an author he so despised and whose knowledge he disdained? Shelford, *Transforming*, 155–57.

in the New Testament in Proposition IX, “Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah,” which he did in parallel columns in hundreds of pages of mind-numbing biblical citations.

This is the context of Huet’s use of the *Testimonium Flavianum*, located in the eighteenth book of the *Antiquities*:

Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ; and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him, for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him; and the tribe of Christians, so named from him are not extinct to this day.²⁹

The utility of this passage for the Christian apologist is obvious; equally obvious is its importance to Huet in proving his third proposition, “The histories written in the New Testament are true.” Josephus was a truly independent source confirming the Gospels’ account (for no one ever seriously proposed that Josephus had converted). Moreover, as both a Jew and a Pharisee, Josephus belonged to precisely those groups considered most hostile to Jesus and his teachings. Finally, the passage explicitly stated that Jesus had fulfilled the sayings of the divine prophets. But, as Huet commented in the *Demonstratio*, the “troubled and vexatious zeal of overly curious men” had nearly toppled the authority of that “excellent testimony in the confirmation of Christian teachings.”³⁰

29 *The Works of Josephus*, trans. William Whiston (1736; rpt. Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1987), 18.3.3 (book.chapter.section number), 480. The Latin version Huet cited in full is: “Fuit autem hoc tempore Jesus vir sapiens: si tamen virum illum oportet dicere. Erat enim mirabilium operum effector, magister hominum qui vera libenter amplectuntur. Et plurimos quidem ex Judaeis, plurimos etiam ex Gentibus ad se pertraxit. Hic erat Christus: cumque eum a primoribus gentis suae accusatum Pilatus ad crucem damnasset, ab eo diligendo non abstiterunt, qui primum coeperant. Nam post tertium diem redivivus ipsis apparuit: cum divini vates haec, aliaque quamplurima admiranda de eo praedixissent. Neque ad hanc diem defecit denominatum ab eo Christianorum genus.” *Demonstratio evangelica*, Propositio III.11. For a modern English translation that differs little in sense from Whiston’s classic version. Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus*, 1.

30 “Praelarum enimvero ad Christiani dogmatis confirmationem testimonium, ut pote ab homine Judaeo, magnique nominis auctore profectum, si non anxia hominum nimis curiosorum et odiosa sedulitas pene illud labefactasset.” *Demonstratio evangelica*, Propositio III.11.

At the close of the sixteenth century, Lucas Osiander declared it a fraud,³¹ and others, including Joseph Scaliger, soon followed. We see the impact of that challenge in two very popular apologetics that preceded Huet's: Philippe du Plessis-Mornay confidently cited the entire passage in the very popular *De la Vérité de la Religion Chrestienne* (1581);³² fewer than fifty years later, Grotius did not similarly employ it in *De veritate religionis Christianae*.³³

The Debate

Anyone writing a traditional Christian apologetic had to consider an assault on the *Testimonium*'s authenticity very serious. The *Testimonium* played a crucial part in Huet's geometricohistorical proof of the truth of Christianity, the feature of the *Demonstratio* he judged truly original, because there was no other remotely contemporary confirmation of Jesus' life, ministry, miracles, and Resurrection besides the Gospels that was as complete.³⁴ External sources

31 Lucas Osiander, *Epitomes historiae ecclesiasticae centuria* (Tübingen, 1592–1604), cent. 1, libr. 2, cap. 7, p. 17.

32 He also made it even more emphatic by employing a French translation that rendered the troublesome phrase "He was the Christ" as "Ce Jesus veritablement estoit le Christ." Philippe de Mornay, *De la Vérité de la Religion Chrestienne* (Paris, 1585), 526. Mornay also claimed that Christian truth could be as certain as the conclusions of a geometrical proof and that his method was similar to that of the geometers, but in reality this was only true of certain truths such as God's existence and the immortality of the soul. These were so obviously true, they could serve as 'first principles' for deductively structured proofs. Such a method could not be applied, however, to the problem of proving that Christianity was the one, true religion. This required revelation, though Mornay could (and did) argue for the truth of the Gospels by appealing to the kinds of 'maxims' noted above. Nor did he anywhere give his argument a geometrical form. Huet was very aware and highly critical of Mornay's apologetic, criticizing it in his autobiography and in the *Huetiana* iv; no doubt he had it in mind when writing the *Demonstratio*. See Shelford, *Thinking Geometrically*.

33 He confined himself to saying that Josephus confirmed details about Herod, Pilate, Festus, Felix, John the Baptist, Gamaliel, and the destruction of Jerusalem. Hugo Grotius, *The Truth of the Christian Religion*, 161. D'Andilly did not draw particular attention to the *Testimonium* in the preface to his translation of the *Antiquities*, though did include it in the appropriate place without critical comment.

34 Christian apologists had long sought confirmation from outside sources, as had Jewish apologists before them. Laplanche, *L'évidence*, 70–71. For example, Huet used many of the same sources of external confirmation as Mornay and Grotius. Grotius cited Suetonius, Tacitus, and Pliny the Younger in "The Proof that there was such a Person as Jesus." Grotius, *Truth*, 87–88; also Jean Le Clerc's notes a,b,a on those pages.

were often circumstantial and scanty. For example, Tacitus devoted one line of the *Annales* to Jesus in a description of the punishments meted out to Roman Christians, “a class of men loathed for their vices” and who were accused of setting fire to Rome.³⁵ Pliny the Younger’s testimony, found in a letter to the Emperor Trajan, is fascinating, but his subject was not Jesus but rather how to prosecute Christians, though he also discussed aspects of their worship and why they had gotten into so much trouble with the Roman authorities.³⁶ Other sources do confirm details of the Gospel accounts (at least to Huet’s satisfaction), and Huet made the most of them. But they gave little specific information about Jesus’ mission and teachings and were utterly mute about the most important event of Jesus’ life, the Resurrection.³⁷ By the rules of his own ‘demonstrative’ game, Huet could not simply assert that divine inspiration guaranteed the truth of Scripture and make an end to it. But if the *Testimonium Flavianum* failed to satisfy the conditions of that first definition regarding textual authenticity, he could not use it. Thus, Huet devoted ten of the twenty-five pages of Proposition III in the 1680 edition to proving the *Testimonium*’s authenticity.

As we navigate the complexities of Huet’s defense, let us keep three points in mind:

First, Huet was no novice in matters of textual criticism, nor was he particularly gullible. He was the veteran of an enormous scholarly effort, the edition of Origen’s commentaries. In it, he had to judge whether Erasmus had falsified Origen’s commentary on Matthew 15:11, a passage generally interpreted as representing Origen’s opinion on the question of the Eucharist. Huet did not particularly like this interpretation, and he proposed his own, but he also believed Erasmus innocent of any manipulation of the text and judged the passage authentic.³⁸ Moreover, Huet was well aware that Christian forgeries posed problems for scholars. In 1662 he wrote to a colleague that he had never doubted the spuriousness of many early works, adding that “the earliest Christians – I mean those of the second and third centuries – liked these pious frauds, and those centuries have bequeathed to us an infinite number of books that have fooled many people and even the most able.”³⁹

35 Tacitus, *Annales*, tr. John Jackson (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), xv.44.

36 Pliny the Younger, *Letters*, Book x.96 (97).

37 *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Propositio III.3–9

38 Shelford, *Transforming*, 146–49.

39 Huet to Gilles Ménage, 23 January 1662, Paris, BnF, MS NAF 1341, fols. 93–94. Here Huet echoed Erasmus: “in those days even pious men thought it pleasing to God to use this deceit to inspire the people with eagerness to read.” Grafton, *Defenders*, 172.

Second, adjudicating such questions as authenticity was never for Huet simply a matter of possessing certain linguistic skills, a command of the context of the texts under review, and a thorough familiarity with other scholars' work. A critic could possess skills and knowledge in abundance, yet come to woefully, even willfully erroneous conclusions. Ultimately being learned did not suffice; the critic also had to have good sense. While this was a quality that could be developed and disciplined through experience, it was also a character trait, one with a moral dimension. Huet's judgment of the work of Richard Simon, which he both knew and clearly respected enough to feel threatened, says it all: despite Simon's technical skills, knowledge, and intelligence, "[h]is self-love [amour-propre] and presumption make him treat with scorn the authors he called to judgment, the greater part of whom are worth more than he."⁴⁰

Third, my intention here is not to judge the quality of Huet's arguments, much less those of the scholars who expressed opposing views. I am not taking sides or suggesting that all opinions expressed were equally valid. On the one hand, Huet's arguments can definitely strike the modern reader as sometimes strained, sometimes more clever than convincing. On the other, Alice Whealey's able review of contemporary critical opinion shows that Huet argued very capably.⁴¹ He could not argue *conclusively*, however – but, then, no one could, which is precisely why his defense was so damaging to his overall project of the *Demonstratio*.

Huet's opening sallies indicate the two major forms of objections that he would be addressing not only in the *Demonstratio*, but in correspondence with his editor in the Netherlands. First and most obviously, if Josephus' manuscript had miraculously survived in pristine condition, the problem of authenticity would never have arisen. Continuous confirmation of its contents from Antiquity, whether found in the works of other authors or actual manuscripts, was the next best thing. Thus, Huet first addressed the record of transmission, stating that it satisfied the requirements of his first axiom, that is, there had been a continuous history of the passage appearing in manuscripts of the *Antiquities*, and various authorities, beginning with Eusebius, had accepted it as authentic. Other 'proofs' were less direct and essentially addressed the question, "Could Josephus have written such a passage?" Many elements came into

40 Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Paris, 1678), Paris, BnF, Réserves A.3498. In the pages bound into the first edition of his own copy of the *Demonstratio*, Huet frequently noted Simon's work. Paris, BnF, Rés. D.870. On Huet and Simon's relationship, see April G. Shelford, "Of Sceptres and Censors: Biblical Interpretation and Censorship in Seventeenth-Century France," *French History* 20, 2 (2006): 161–81.

41 Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus*, chapters 3 and 4.

play here: Josephus' character, his *métier* as a historian, his attitude towards what he allegedly reported, the precise meaning of words and phrases, consistency of tone, and literary style. Thus, Huet judged it extremely unlikely that Josephus, a diligent historian of the Jews, would have remained silent about a public figure of such interest not only to the Jews, but to the entire world.⁴² Nor did it make any sense that he would mention John the Baptist and James, yet ignore the far more important figure of Jesus. As remarkable as the passage appeared to some, it would have been far more remarkable had Josephus not mentioned Jesus. Moreover, Huet was not put off as some were by the style of the passage; any reader familiar with Josephus would recognize that the use of a Hellenized rhetorical style and locutions were typical in his writing.⁴³

Huet then addressed the arguments of those who rejected the *Testimonium*'s authenticity. In 1661, a collection of correspondence among savants disputing the question had been published in Holland, which Huet clearly drew upon to compose his refutation in the *Demonstratio*. First, some had noted that neither Origen (184/5–253/4) nor Theodoretus (393–457), both of whom were familiar with Josephus' works, ever claimed that Josephus recognized Jesus as the Messiah. Yet the *Testimonium* clearly stated, "This was the Christ." These doubting Thomases concluded that either the passage did not appear in the manuscripts Origen and Theodoretus read, or it was a fraud. Not surprisingly, Huet responded that Origen and Theodoretus could have consulted mutilated copies. But he also asserted that the sense of Origen's and Theodoretus' comments had to be correctly construed. Writing "This was the Christ" was not the same thing as saying, "I, Josephus, believe Jesus was the Christ." The phrase was not a statement of belief, but an identifier; it meant roughly the same thing as "This was Jesus, who was said to be the Christ." Moreover, many people had referred to Jesus as 'Christ' without for a moment believing he was. Were Tacitus and Suetonius professing Jesus as their savior when they wrote of 'Christ'? Josephus referred to Jesus as 'Christ' in the same spirit Pilate referred to him as 'king of the Jews' in the placard nailed to the cross, that is, as Jesus himself claimed. This was precisely how Jerome understood the passage when he translated it, "And he was believed to be Christ." So it was not surprising that Origen and Theodoretus denied that Josephus recognized Jesus as the

42 One can accept Huet's reasoning here, of course, yet believe the *Testimonium* is not what Josephus actually wrote. One scholar, for example, attempted a reconstruction of what Josephus might have written, which Thackeray published in his Loeb translation. Robert Eisler, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, trans. Alexander Haggerty Krappe (London: Methuen, 1931), 62.

43 *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Propositio III.II.

Christ and looked to another, the Emperor Vespasian, to fulfill the prophecy. Yet some objected that Josephus, if he did not believe Jesus to be the Christ, ought to have denounced him as a fraud. Huet responded that Josephus knew what the task of a historian was: to report the facts without interposing his own judgment. This, according to Huet, was precisely what Josephus did (not a bad argument had Josephus himself not belied it with his continuous and impassioned editorializing).

The second objection raised was more serious because it challenged Huet's assertion that the *Testimonium* satisfied one of his own basic requirements for an authentic text. If Josephus had written the *Testimonium*, then why hadn't early Christian apologists such as Justin (103–165) and Tertullian (160–225) cited it? They surely would have found the passage useful in their battles with both Gentiles and Jews. Why did the ninth-century Patriarch of Constantinople, Photius (810–893), who included Josephus' works in his *Bibliotheca*, fail to mention the *Testimonium*? With respect to early Christian writers, Huet alleged that the Jews had falsified Josephus' text, an accusation he had resorted to earlier when he emended Josephus' account of the death of James, Jesus' brother, based on Origen's and Eusebius' citations. It was unacceptable to think that Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and other early Christian writers were liars. Rather, it was more likely that the passage had been expunged from Josephus' books by Jews who found it intolerable that one of their own might compose such a 'remarkable' testimony – and it was, after all, much easier to delete something from a work than to insert something. Huet also claimed that manuscript evidence existed to prove that the *Testimonium* had been intentionally deleted. Caesar Baronius (1538–1607) wrote in his *Annales ecclesiastici a Christo nato ad annum 1198* (1598) that he had found a manuscript Hebrew translation of Josephus' *Antiquities* from which the *Testimonium* had obviously been physically deleted, and Huet asserted that a manuscript confirming Baronius' assertion resided in the Vatican library.⁴⁴

The fact that Photius did not mention the *Testimonium Flavianum* anywhere in his *Bibliotheca* (or *Inventory and Enumeration of the Books That We*

44 On Baronius, see Schreckenberg, *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*, 158; Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus*, 86–89. By March 1789, Huet had rather less reason to believe this as a friend in Rome, Pierre Poussines, wrote that his contacts there had failed to produce any such manuscript evidence. Poussines to Huet, 7 March 1679, in Paris, BnF, MS Fr. 15188, fols. 341–345. Whaley writes that Baronius possibly confused the *Antiquities* with the *Josippon*, a tenth-century work written in Hebrew whose account of the Jewish revolt differed from Josephus' at many points and that was intended for a Jewish audience. Poussines' informant came to a similar conclusion.

Have Read) could prove even more troublesome to someone like Huet. Written during the ninth century, it contains some 280 numbered descriptions; its many references to Josephus' *Antiquities*, as Huet duly noted, indicated Photius' thorough familiarity with the work.⁴⁵ According to Huet, some might interpret Photius' omission of the *Testimonium* in his discussion of Josephus' fifteenth book as proof that he thought it spurious. But following this logic, we would have to believe that Photius judged the fourteen preceding books spurious, because he did not mention them either – an absurd conclusion arrived at through equally absurd reasoning! Moreover, Photius claimed that Josephus noted the Slaughter of the Innocents in his description of Herod's reign, though that event was not to be found in the *Antiquities* familiar to Huet and his colleagues.⁴⁶ Huet nearly crowed at this bit of 'evidence.' If we declared inauthentic what Photius did not mention, Huet reasoned, then we had to accept as authentic what he *did*. Hence Huet's adversaries could either accept the *Testimonium* or the passage cited by Photius, but they had to accept one or the other, and either confirmed important elements of the Christ story. Huet continued that Photius only discussed the beginning and end of the *Antiquities*; were we to conclude from this that only the beginning and the end were authentic? Of course not!

Believing he had dealt satisfactorily with gaps in the manuscript record, Huet made short work of various other objections. Some believed that, sandwiched as it was between Pilate's problems in Judea and the desecration of the temple of Isis at Rome, the *Testimonium* broke the thread of Josephus' narrative. Huet objected that historians often brought together diverse and sometimes incongruent narratives to enhance the reader's pleasure. If you made such diversions the basis for an accusation of fraud, he argued, then you arbitrarily shackled the historian with innumerable narrow strictures and condemned him to a slavishly chronological approach to which Josephus, in any event, never adhered.⁴⁷ Huet then briefly took issue with two objections raised by the scholar David Blondel (1591–1655): First, if Josephus used the phrase translated into Latin as *'e gentibus'*, he would have erred, because Jesus had attracted only one or two pagans to his following. Second, Josephus could not

45 See Photius, *Bibliothèque*, tr. René Henry (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1967), v: 142–155; I: 32–35 and 155–158; Warren T. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies/Harvard University, 1980).

46 *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Propositio III.13. To be honest, Huet squeezed more out of the passage in Photius than seems reasonable, that is, with respect to acknowledging Jesus' status as the son of God and the Virgin Birth.

47 *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Propositio III.14.

have properly employed the Greek *'phylon'* for tribe or people when speaking of the Jews and Gentiles from whom Jesus' followers came. To the first, Huet responded that Josephus was indirectly testifying to the evangelizing success of the apostles in his own time. Of the second, he noted that usage of this term was still much debated by grammarians, but who, in any event, expected all the subtlety and polish of Greek oratory from a Hellenized Jew? Finally Huet responded to those who objected that Josephus would hardly have been inclined to write that Jesus had fulfilled the prophecies or had risen from the dead. Huet asserted that Josephus did so in the same spirit that he wrote "This was the Christ," that is, he reported what was believed, not what he himself considered true.

We might think (and hope!) that Huet had sufficiently defended the *Testimonium Flavianum*, but no such luck. Huet still had to deal with his old friend, Tanneguy Le Fèvre, who had authored the latest and, in some ways, the most devastating critique of the *Testimonium*. Le Fèvre, as Huet's correspondence with him shows, was a rather bizarre figure.⁴⁸ A native of Caen (1615–1672), he had been Catholic, converted to Calvinism, and subsequently pursued an academic career in Protestant institutions, most notably at Saumur where he was named to the Greek chair in 1665. Huet probably overestimated his chance at converting him, but, more important here, Le Fèvre's reputation as an outstanding Hellenist made him impossible to ignore.

Le Fèvre delivered his judgment of the *Testimonium's* authenticity in a letter to Johannes Chabrielis, published in the same compendium of scholarly epistles that Huet consulted when writing the *Demonstratio*.⁴⁹ He began with a stunningly obvious observation: precisely the elements of the *Testimonium* that made it so attractive to Christian apologists should have made it suspect. He repeated his predecessors' claims that it would have been unlikely for a Jew and a Pharisee to write such a passage. Le Fèvre also noted the stylistic dissimilarities, terming the style of the *Testimonium* as 'frigid,' 'slack,' 'inert,' and 'disagreeable.'⁵⁰ He took issue with many other aspects of the *Testimonium*,

48 For biographical details, see Emmanuel Bury, "Tanneguy Le Fèvre, professeur de grec, à l'Académie de Saumur," *Saumur, capitale européenne du protestantisme au XVII^e siècle* (Fontevault: Centre culturel de l'Ouest, 1991), 79–89. For an analysis of his correspondence, see Joy A. Kleinstuber, "La République des Lettres à Saumur: Le cercle Tanneguy Le Fèvre" in the same volume, 91–96; also see Huet's correspondence with him in *A travers les papiers de Huet*, ed. Leon Pélissier (Paris, 1889), 9–12.

49 His opinion had first been published separately as *Flavii Josephi de Jesu Domino Testimonium suppositum esse diatriba* in 1655.

50 Le Fèvre, *Flavii Josephi Quae Repereri Potuerunt Opera Omnia* (Amsterdam, 1726), II: 268 at 298–299.

inspecting the passage's phraseology closely. He also pointed out what terrible impiety it would have been for a Jew to suggest that miracle-working indicated the divinity of a miracle worker. By that standard, the Jews would have had to accept Moses and Elijah as divine. Moreover, for the Jews, the *sine qua non* of being a Messiah was not the ability to work miracles, but descent from David's lineage. The Gospels themselves indicated as much.⁵¹

Le Fèvre also seems to have believed that, for Josephus to have written "This was the Christ," he would have had to accept him as such. If so, shouldn't Josephus have expressed a little more excitement at the long-awaited fulfillment of the prophecy and the advent of the deliverer of Israel? Also, Josephus announced in the preface of the *Antiquities* his intention to explain to a gentile audience "who the Jews originally were, what fortunes they had been subjected to and by what legislator they had been instructed in piety, and the exercise of other virtues, what wars also they had made in remote ages, till they were unwillingly engaged in this last with the Romans."⁵² Why, then, would Josephus employ the term 'Christ' in a manner wholly unintelligible to his target audience?

Then Le Fèvre compared the *Testimonium* with another passage of the *Antiquities*, generally considered authentic (except by Blondel!), where Josephus did praise his subject, John the Baptist. According to Josephus, many contemporary Jews believed that the destruction of Herod's army was God's just punishment for the king's execution of John, "who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism."⁵³ According to Le Fèvre, the briefest familiarity with Josephus' biography was enough to understand why he would have found John the Baptist a sympathetic character: John's asceticism, even his use of water for purification would have reminded Josephus of the spiritual master Banus, with whom he had studied in his youth. Le Fèvre pointed out the lack of stylistic similarity between this authentic passage and the *Testimonium*; he also pointed out that Josephus never connected John the Baptist with Christ as a prefiguration, which we would expect if either the John the Baptist passage were forged or the *Testimonium* were authentic. Le Fèvre even took the poor placement of the *Testimonium* as proof of the forger's incompetence; he would have aroused less suspicion had he placed it in the fifth chapter of the eighteenth book.⁵⁴ And he accused Jerome of abetting

⁵¹ Here Le Fèvre cited Matthew 22:41–45.

⁵² Josephus, *Antiquities*, Preface.2.

⁵³ Josephus, *Antiquities*, 18: 5: 2.

⁵⁴ The fourth chapter in Whiston's translation.

the fraud by translating the phrase “This was the Christ” as “He it was who was believed to be Christ.”⁵⁵

Finally, Le Fèvre considered the gaps in the manuscript record. No Christian apologist before Eusebius ever cited a passage so potentially useful in anti-pagan and anti-Jewish polemics. How was it possible that Origen never employed such formidable evidence? Origen certainly knew Josephus’ work, referring to Josephus’ discussion of John the Baptist and the execution of James, Jesus’ brother. From the gaps in the manuscript record, Le Fèvre drew a conclusion very different from Huet’s. The manuscripts that Justin, Tertullian, and Origen consulted had not been falsified by the Jews; rather, a Christian had later falsified Josephus’ history, and that Christian was none other than Eusebius. In a single blow, Le Fèvre dared to challenge not only the authenticity of the *Testimonium Flavianum*, but the integrity of Eusebius, whose works were crucial for the history of early Christianity, but whom Le Fèvre judged ‘vain’ and ‘superficial.’⁵⁶

Much of what Huet had already written applied to Le Fèvre’s arguments as well. Yet despite the fact that he announced his intention to deal with Le Fèvre’s remaining arguments briefly, Huet devoted four pages in the 1680 edition to refuting them – indication enough of just how seriously he took this critique. That Josephus was a Pharisee was no impediment to his speaking well of Jesus, Huet wrote, for Paul had also been a Pharisee. Nor did being a Pharisee prevent Josephus from claiming that the prophecies had, in fact, been fulfilled by the Emperor Vespasian. When it came to stylistic considerations, Huet offered little but ridicule. Continuing Le Fèvre’s jokes about the passage smelling bad, Huet turned up his nose at Le Fèvre’s arguments about literary style. To sniff out such a forgery, he wrote, Le Fèvre must have been endowed with an extraordinarily (and unbelievably) sensitive nose.⁵⁷ With respect to miracle-working and divinity, Huet denied that the Jews never ascribed divinity to their Messiah. Moreover, he claimed that, when Josephus wrote “if it be lawful to call him a man,” he was only employing a common rhetorical device to stress the wondrousness of Jesus’ acts. The pagans, Huet added, often did the same, and he offered nearly a page of examples to prove his point. What about Le Fèvre’s objection that Josephus ought to have explained what he

55 Le Fèvre, II: 270 at 317.

56 Le Fèvre, II: 270–273; also see Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus*, 129–34. Solomon Zeitlin also asserted that Eusebius forged the passage in “The Christ Passage in Josephus,” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 18, 3 (January 1928): 231–55. Eusebius cited the *Testimonium* both in the *Demonstratio evangelica*, III.IV.124 and in the *Ecclesiastical History*, Book I, Chapter 11.

57 *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Propositio III.18.

meant by 'Christ'? Huet responded that this would only have been necessary if Josephus believed that Jesus was the Christ; merely using the term as a cognomen placed him under no such obligation. He denied the dissimilarities between the passage about John the Baptist and the *Testimonium*. And he asserted that the John the Baptist passage lacked any mention of prefiguration because, once again, that was not Jewish doctrine, and Josephus would only have had to mention it if convinced that Jesus was truly the Messiah.

Up to a point, Huet's tone remained relatively light, even bantering. But he obviously could not view with equanimity the far more serious charges that Le Fèvre leveled first against Jerome, then against Eusebius. By making Jerome an accomplice in fraud, Le Fèvre had chosen to damn two, rather than absolve one, and Huet would not allow such an injury to be done to such a holy man. He also dismissed as 'vain' Le Fèvre's conclusions about gaps in the manuscript record; anyway, it was a point he had already addressed. Ultimately, Huet judged Le Fèvre injudicious. However learned, he was also reckless, substituting impossibilities for what everyone (or, at least, everyone who mattered!) had known from time immemorial. Huet claimed to act 'more simply and openly' While he was willing to admit 'acute and erudite conjectures,' he would do so only as such and no more – conjectures.⁵⁸

Huet no doubt thought he had acquitted himself well in defending the *Testimonium*'s authenticity and altogether quit of the matter. But after the *Demonstratio* was published in France in 1679, he had to contend with still more objections from the editor of the Dutch edition, Christophe Sandius (1644–1680). On the face of it, Sandius was a very unlikely choice as editor because of his heterodox views. Indeed, three friends had warned Huet about them during the 1670s.⁵⁹ But in 1676 Sandius had impressed Huet as both learned and serious, reading the Origen commentaries closely enough to make intelligent observations from which Huet himself could profit.⁶⁰ Yet though Sandius respected Huet, he did not hesitate to express his reservations about the *Testimonium*'s authenticity. A series of letters records a running skirmish between editor and author that continued for nearly six months. Huet clearly took Sandius' objections very seriously. He had a copy of the first edition of the *Demonstratio evangelica* collated with blank sheets to record additional notes;

58 *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Propositio III.18.

59 Henri Justel to Huet, 3 janvier 1672, Paris, BnF, MS Fr. 15189, fol. 170r–171v; Etienne Le Moyne to Huet, 20 July 1677, *ibid.*, fols. 230r–232r; Georg Graevius to Huet, Idib. Sextilibus Julianis 1676, Florence, BL, MS Ashburnham 501.

60 Florence, BL, MS Ashburnham 501; Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 11432, fols. 209–12.

there he listed three exchanges with Sandius, even transcribing an excerpt from Sandius' letter of September 1679.⁶¹

Sandius essentially argued that Josephus could only have written the *Testimonium* if he were a Christian; like other scholars, he found the phrase "He was the Christ" particularly problematic. In his September letter, for example, he argued that when Josephus identified Vespasian as the Messiah, he had good reason to flatter him (that is, a desire to save his own skin), but no reason to write a positive account of Jesus. In fact, as a Pharisee, he had every reason to consider Christ a rebel, heretic, evil-doer, and destroyer of the laws. Thus, if Josephus really wrote the *Testimonium*, he must have been a Christian and a Jew only in the sense in which the Romans promiscuously lumped together the Jews with Nazarenes, Ebionites, and Christians. That was the only way that Sandius could account for Josephus' use of the phrases "He was the Christ" and "if it is lawful to call him a man." In an October letter, he gave his argument an interesting twist as he responded to Huet's rejoinders. If Josephus had written the *Testimonium*, Sandius wrote, he certainly would have been expelled from the Temple; as we have no evidence that Josephus was expelled, he could not have written the *Testimonium*.⁶² In a third letter to Huet written in November, he asserted that Scripture itself proved that Josephus could never have used the phrase "He was the Christ" in the manner Huet alleged. "Whoever writes that Jesus is Christ, he himself believes not only with his heart, but makes confession with his mouth, and consequently is of God, 1 John 5:1,⁶³ and thus is a Christian. Josephus did this. Ergo etc. Ergo he ought to have been ejected from the synagogue. But Josephus was not ejected from the synagogue. Ergo he did not write [the *Testimonium*]."⁶⁴ Josephus could never have used the word 'Christ' as a 'neutral' appellation as Suetonius or Tacitus did because they did not care whether Jesus was the Messiah or not. Just as a Lutheran could not

61 Sandius Prid Cal Sept 1679; Huet 16 Cal Oct 1679; Sandius 5 Cal Oct 1679; Huet 3 Id Oct 1679; Sandius 13 Nov 1679; Huet 3 Id Jan 1680. These indications face pages 30–31 of Huet's annotated copy of the first edition of the *Demonstratio evangelica*, Paris, BnF, Rés. D.870.

62 Sandius to Huet, 5 Cal Oct 1679, in Florence, BL, MS Ashburnham 1866, 2167. It seems likely that Sandius was thinking of Spinoza, who had written positively about Christ and who had been expelled from the synagogue by his co-religionists.

63 "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God; and everyone that loveth him that begot loveth him also that is begotten of him."

64 "Quicunque scripsit Jesum esse Christum, non solum corde idem credidit, sed et oro confessus est, et per consequens ex Deo est, i John. V.I. adeoque & Christianus est. Josephus id fecit. Ergo etc. Ergo ex synagoga ejici debuit. Sed Josephus non fuit ex Synagoga ejectus. Ergo id non scripsit." Sandius to Huet, 13 November 1679, in Florence, BL, MS Ashburnham 2168.

write with impunity that the pope was the absolute and infallible monarch and head of the universal church without being punished, Josephus could not have written "This was the Christ" or about the fulfillment of the prophecies without running similar risks.

Sandius' arguments were variations upon themes already familiar to us. The same is true of Huet's responses, in which he sought to balance *politesse* with increasing impatience, even exasperation. There is no need to detail them here except to note that Huet never budged from the position expressed in his first response to Sandius, that is, while he deeply appreciated his editor's diligence and even agreed to some of his corrections, he refused to entertain any changes to his defense of the *Testimonium*.⁶⁵ It is rather more likely that Sandius was thoroughly sick of the subject than truly persuaded when he wrote in February 1680 that Huet had banished all his doubts about the *Testimonium's* authenticity and that he could make no response to Huet's most recent arguments.⁶⁶ Thus, the Dutch edition of the *Demonstratio* contained Huet's defense of the *Testimonium* intact.

A Necessarily Inconclusive Conclusion

Here I have followed the track of an erudite argument that Huet and his colleagues, living and dead, zealously pursued. We cannot feel the same passion for the hunt that, for Huet, began and ended in Amsterdam. Indeed, some readers might think that I have retraced its twists and turns to the point of tedium. But the argument's sheer complexity, the number of contributors, its many feints and parries help me make a wider point that goes to the heart of Huet's project in the *Demonstratio*. It is unimaginable to me that Huet could have resisted the temptation to dive into such an important contemporary debate. Wholly typical of his scholarly breed, he did not wear his erudition lightly, and he relished a good scholarly fight – especially if he had the chance to cross swords with a formidable contemporary, even a rival like Le Fèvre who could no longer talk back. But however well he argued, when Huet set out to refute the arguments against the *Testimonium Flavianum's* authenticity, he unwittingly opened the gates to a Trojan horse. Once the *Testimonium's* authenticity had been questioned, there was absolutely no way, within the confines of contemporary humanist critical discourse, to settle the issue definitively. Arguments based

65 Huet to Sandius, xvi Cal. Oct 1679, in Florence, BL, MS Ashburnham 2476.

66 Sandius to Huet, ix Cal February 1680, in Florence, BL, MS Ashburnham 2169.

on historical and philological evidence could be more or less persuasive, but could also lead to infinite debate.

Ultimately, Huet could no more prove that the Jews had falsified Josephus than Le Fèvre could prove that Eusebius had. Thus, the *Testimonium* could not perform the critical role of confirming New Testament events, which was critical to proving Huet's third proposition, "The histories written in the New Testament are new." In the end, the truth of the events narrated in the Gospels could only be accepted on faith; there was no way to prove that they had actually happened within the framework of the geometricohistorical method Huet had devised, and thus no way that these "facts" could fulfill the function assigned to them by the logic of Huet's proof of the truth of the Christian religion. He had not created a truly deductive historical method; he had only dressed up critical method in geometrical garb. Far from proving that the truths of history, much less those of religion, could be proved rationally and deductively, Huet had given Descartes the last word: "Supposing now that all were wholly open and candid, and never thrust upon us doubtful opinions as true, but expounded every matter in good faith, yet since scarcely anything has been asserted by any one man the contrary of which has not been alleged by another, we should be eternally uncertain which of the two to believe."⁶⁷

67 Descartes, *Rules for the Direction of the Mind*, in *The Philosophical Works*, 1: 5–6.

The Plan of Pierre-Daniel Huet's Demonstratio evangelica

Definitions

- I An authentic book is one that was written by that author by whom it was said to have been written, and around that time when it is said that it was written.
- II A contemporary book is one that was written around that time when the events related in it occurred.
- III A history is a narrative of things that occurred in that very time about which that history is written.
- IV A prophecy is a narrative of future events that had not yet occurred in the period when that prophecy was announced and which could not have been foreseen from natural causes.
- V A true religion is one that proposes only true things to be believed.
- VI The Christian Religion is that which establishes that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, and holds whatever had been written about him in the sacred books, whether the Old or New Testament, as true.

Postulates

- I It is postulated that a docile spirit and one zealous for truth is applied here, not a stubborn and obstinate one.
- II Things that will be proved here should be the objects of as certain belief as anything else that rests on such firm arguments.

Axioms

- I Every book is authentic which has been believed authentic by all people around that time [when it was written] and continuously since then.
- II Every history is true, which narrates events in the same way they are narrated in many contemporary books or books nearly contemporary to the period of the events.
- III Every prophecy is true which predicts something that afterwards is accomplished in the event.
- IV All prophetic ability is from God.

Propositions

- I The books of the New Testament are authentic.
 - II The books of the New Testament are contemporary.
 - III The histories written in the New Testament are true.
 - IV The books of the Old Testament are authentic.
 - V There are many prophecies in the Old Testament.
 - VI Many prophecies in the Old Testament are true.
 - VII Many prophecies in the Old Testament are about the Messiah.
 - VIII The Messiah is He in whom all the prophecies of the Old Testament regarding the Messiah are found conjoined.
 - IX Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah.
 - X The Christian Religion is true.
-

PART 3

Extended Discussions and Editions



Christian Scepticism

The Reception of Xenophanes' B34 in Heathen and Christian Antiquity and its Sequel in Byzantine Thought

John A. Demetracopoulos

Introduction

1 'Christian Scepticism' as a Historiographical Term

'Christian Scepticism' is an established historiographical term. It enjoys a secure place in dictionaries, and it features in some monographs on the subject.¹ In fact, Christianity's venerable alliance with Scepticism was noted by the founder of the scholarly branch of the history of philosophy, Johann Jacob Brucker (1696–1770):

Et nonnullos quidem pro religionis revelatae atque ecclesiae decretis ad Scepticismum confugisse [...] discimus, eo quod crederent non certiorum victoriam se de hostibus veritatis divinae deportare posse, quam si rationis illis tela eriperent, omnemque in veritate inquirenda certitudinem intellectui humano denegarent. *Id quod imprimis ab Ecclesiae Romanae doctoribus factum est*, cum examinis via valde premerentur, ratis eam impossibilem fore, si rationis usus in his nullus certus esset. [...] Quod argumentum [...] ab eo tempore valde invaluit [...].²

1 See, e.g., Vincent Garraud, "Scepticisme chrétien," in *Dictionnaire critique de théologie*, ed. Jean-Yves Lacoste (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1998; 2002), 1076–78; Giuseppe M. Sciacca, *Scetticismo cristiano* (Palermo: Palumbo, 1968). See also *Le scepticisme chrétien (xvi^e–xviii^e siècle)*, a special issue of *Les Études Philosophiques* 85, 2 (2008): 137–275. See also Richard Henry Popkin, "Skepticism in Modern Thought," in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, ed. Philip Paul Wiener (New York: Scribners, 1973), IV: 240–51, at 243; id., "Skeptics and Scepticism," in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Lindsay Jones (Detroit: Macmillan, 2005), IV: 8420–22.

2 Johann Jacob Brucker, *Institutiones historiae philosophicae usui academicae juventutis*, III, 1, 3, 1, 8 (Leipzig: Christoph Breitkopf, 1747), 542 (italics are mine). Cf. id., *Historia critica philosophiae a mundi incunabulis ad nostram usque aetatem deducta*, IV, 1 (Leipzig: Christoph Breitkopf, 1743; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1975), 606–609. Cf., e.g., Lactantius, *Epitome "Divinarum Institutionum"* 35, 5: "Quoniam . . . nulla est . . . humana sapientia, sequamur ergo divinam Deoque gratias agamus, qui eam nobis et revelavit et tradidit, ac nobis gratulemur,

However, scholarship has mainly addressed Christian Scepticism in the modern era, i.e., from Erasmus, Raymond of Sebond, Montaigne, and Pascal, to Kierkegaard and Lev Shestov.³ The standard narrative says that Christians in Antiquity were by and large hostile to Scepticism and that it was not until the Early Modern period that Christian intellectuals began to combine it with fideism. Of course, as scholars have shown,⁴ the modern variety of Scepticism was combined not only with fideism but also with irreligion, the other extreme. The few existing studies of the reception of Scepticism in the Latin Middle Ages⁵

quod veritatem ac sapientiam caelesti beneficio tenemus, quam tot ingeniis, tot aetatibus requisitam philosophia numquam potuit invenire" (Eberhard Heck and Antonie Wlosok, ed., *Lactantius. Epitome "Divinarum Institutionum"* [Stuttgart-Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1994], 49, 21–50, 5).

- 3 See, e.g., Richard Henry Popkin, *The History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Spinoza* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979); Terence Penelhum, *God and Scepticism* (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1983); José R. Maia Neto, *The Christianization of Pyrrhonism. Scepticism and Faith in Pascal, Kierkegaard and Shestov* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995); Gianni Paganini, *Skepsis. Le débat des Modernes sur le Scepticisme* (Paris: Vrin, 2008); Walter Cavini, "Sulla prima diffusione in Occidente delle opere di Sesto Empirico," *Medioevo* 3 (1977): 1–20. See also the adoption of Brucker's conception of the historical relation of Christianity to Scepticism in the concluding paragraph of the entry "Pyrrhonienne ou Sceptique philosophie" in the *Encyclopédie*: "[...] entre les sceptiques modernes, les uns ont cherché à décrire la philosophie pour donner de l'autorité à la révélation [...]," entry written by Denis Diderot, in Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d'Alembert, ed., *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, XIII (Neuchâtel: Samuel Fauche, 1765; repr. Stuttgart: Frommann Verlag, 1995), 608–14, at 613b. On Diderot's debt to Brucker's *Historia critica philosophiae*, see Paolo Casini, *Diderot "philosophe"* (Bari: Laterza, 1962), 253–61. The idea of the historical connection between Scepticism and fideism passed in the first half of the nineteenth century to G.W.F. Hegel, C.F. Köppen, and K. Marx, who held that Scepticism (e.g., in the form of Kantianism), "by drastically restricting or even annihilating the circle of certain knowledge, leaves the field open to religion, in the sense that faith comes to fill in the gap of knowledge"; quotation from Panagiotis Kondylis, *Ὁ Μάρξ καὶ ἡ ἀρχαία Ἑλλάδα* (Athens: Stigme, 1984), 22–23; see also id., *Die Entstehung der Dialektik. Eine Analyse der geistigen Entwicklung von Hölderlin, Schelling und Hegel bis 1802* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1979), 691ff.; id., *Κὰρλ Μάρξ. Διαφορὰ τῆς δημοκρίτειας καὶ ἐπικούρειας φιλοσοφίας. Διδακτορική διατριβή. Εἰσαγωγή, μετάφραση, ὑπομνηματισμός* (Athens: Gnosis, 1983), 28; 195–96. See Karl Marx, *Hefte zur epikureischen, stoischen und skeptischen Philosophie*, in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Werke. Ergänzungsband: Schriften, Manuskripte, Briefe bis 1844. Erster Teil* (East Berlin: Dietz, 1968), II, 70.
- 4 See, e.g., Gianni Paganini and José R. Maia Neto, introduction to Paganini and Maia Neto, ed., *Renaissance Scepticisms* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2009), 1–11, at 4–5; 10–11.
- 5 See, e.g., *Rethinking the History of Skepticism. The Missing Medieval Background*, ed. Henrik Lagerlund (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

focus on philological issues such as the transmission of Sextus Empiricus's writings, or on the purely epistemological questions addressed by Scepticism, rather than on whether or how Scepticism was deemed compatible with Christian faith and fitted into Christian theology.⁶ It seems that the relations of Greek (and Latin) patristic literature with the ancient philosophical schools might profitably be studied in this respect, too.⁷

This paper stands as a case study of Christian Scepticism. It focuses on the Christian reception of the celebrated fr. B34 of Xenophanes (ca. 570/560–ca. 475 BC),⁸ a fragment that is traditionally – and with justification – seen as the earliest extant philosophical pronouncement of some form of sceptical epistemology or even epistemological pessimism. After some brief remarks on the fragment itself, I trace its reception in the non-Christian literature of Antiquity (Part I). This narrative sheds light on the Christian reception that followed, since, as will become evident, its Christian reception both in Late Antiquity and in the Byzantine period (Part II) was mainly shaped by its heathen reception. True, one must be aware of the fact that the loss of all of Xenophanes's writings, in combination with the loss of innumerable ancient Greek philosophical writings (some of which had presumably echoed Xenophanes's epistemological ideas), renders any research into the *Rezeptionsgeschichte* such as this one *e limine* fragmentary. Still, the evidence available to us seems to

6 In the moderns' reception of Xenophanes, it seems that the epistemological issues raised by the scepticism in B34, although of some interest, came second to the issue of the nature of deity (monism, monotheism, pantheism, etc.) and were annexed to it. See Jonathan I. Israel, *Enlightenment Contested. Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1670–1752* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 436–45.

7 See, e.g., the recent work, covering pagan authors as well, on the presence of Academic Scepticism in 2nd-century AD literature, by Beatrice Wyss, "Akademie, Akademiker und Skeptiker. Studien zur Rezeption der Akademie in der lateinischen und griechischen Literatur des zweiten Jahrhunderts nach Christus," PhD diss., University of Freiburg (CH), 2005 (<http://ethesis.unifr.ch/theses/downloads/php?file=WyssB.pdf>; accessed September 28, 2012). Some modern representatives of Christian Scepticism (e.g., Joseph Glanvill) did have some idea of the positive reception of ancient Scepticism by some Fathers of the Church; see, e.g., John A. Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα Κατὰ Πύρρωνος. Πλατωνικός φιλοσkeptικισμός καὶ ἀριστοτελικός ἀντισkeptικισμός στὴ βυζαντινὴ διανόηση τοῦ 14^{ου} αἰῶνα* (with an English Summary: *Nicholas Cabasilas' "Contra Pyrrhonem."* Introduction, Critical Edition, Modern Greek Translation, Philosophical Analysis, and Historical Context) (Athens: Parousia, 1999), 255, n. 436.

8 See, e.g., James H. Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon. Fragments* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 3. Holger Thesleff, "On Dating Xenophanes," *Symbolae Osloenses* 23, 3 (1957): 3–22, has argued for placing Xenophanes a generation later, i.e., in ca. 540–440 BC.

indicate a certain direction, as I methodically demonstrate below and summarize in conclusion.

2 Some Remarks on Xenophanes's B34

For convenience's sake, I quote here the fragment in its fullest available version, the one preserved in Sextus Empiricus's *Adversus Mathematicos* (VII, 49; 110; VIII, 326).⁹ I mark the words and phrases echoed in subsequent authors (who are discussed below), using numbers in brackets (for verbal similarities) and braces (for similarities *quoad sensum*):

Καὶ τὸ μὲν οὖν σαφές [1] οὐ [2] τις [3] ἀνὴρ [4] ἴδεν¹⁰ [5] οὐδέ [6] τις [3] ἔσται
εἰδώς [7] ἀμφὶ θεῶν [8] τε καὶ ἄσσα λέγω [9] περὶ πάντων [10].

9 Hermann Diels and Walther Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Vol. I (Dublin: Weidmann, 1951), 137, 1–5; Hermann Mutschmann, *Sexti Empirici opera. Vol. II Adversus Dogmaticos libros quinque (Adversus Mathematicos VII–XI) continens* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1914), 12; 25; 178. Sextus also quotes the latter half of the last verse in his *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* II, 18; ed. Jürgen Mau, *Sexti Empirici opera*, I, *Πυρρωνείων ὑποτυπώσεων libros tres continens* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1958), 68. A list of the ancient sources that preserve B34 in some version or other is offered by Simon Karsten, *Xenophanis Colophonii carminum reliquiae. De vita ejus et studiis* (Brussels: Frank, 1830), 51–53; 199 (fragment numbered as “XIV”). See also Ernst Heitsch, *Xenophanes. Die Fragmente* (Munich: Artemis, 1983), 76. To this list, add Theodoret (discussed below, 345–346). Cf. Appendix. Proclus's testimonium (*In Platonis “Timaeum” commentaria* II, in Ernst Diehl, *Procli Diadochi In Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, I (Leipzig: Teubner, 1903), 254, 20–23): “... τὸ κριτήριον θεμένων [...] δόξαν, ὥσπερ ὁ λέγων· ‘δόκος δ’ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται’...” seems to rely on Sextus Empiricus's *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* II, 18 or a closely similar source, for Proclus focuses on the issue of the ‘criterion of truth’ and quotes only the part of B34 that is quoted by Sextus in the context of his discussion of this specific issue.

10 Cf. Homer, *Ilias* II, 484–7 et alibi. On the Homeric provenance of Xenophanes's phrasing here, see Wilhelm Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos. Die Selbstentfaltung des griechischen Denkens von Homer bis auf die Sophistik und Sokrates* (Stuttgart: Kröner, 1942; repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1966), 87–95; Bruno Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes. Studien zur Entstehung des europäischen Denkens bei den Griechen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975), 127–38, especially 127–29; James H. Lesher, “Xenophanes' Scepticism,” *Phronesis* 23, 1 (1978): 1–21 (repr. in *Essays in Ancient Greek Philosophy*, ed. John P. Anton and Anthony Preus, II [Albany: SUNY Press, 1983], 20–39, at 12–13); Edward Hussey, “The Beginnings of Epistemology: from Homer to Philolaus,” in *Companions to Ancient Thought*, ed. Stephen Everson, Vol. I: *Epistemology* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 11–38, at 16–18; James H. Lesher, “The Humanizing of Knowledge in Presocratic Thought,” in *Oxford Handbook of Presocratic Philosophy*, ed. Patricia Curd and Daniel Graham (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 458–84, at 459–64.

εἰ γὰρ καὶ [11] τὰ μάλιστα τύχοι τετελεσμένον [12] εἰπών¹¹ [9],
αὐτὸς [13] ὁμῶς οὐκ [7] οἶδε [5]· δόκος [14] δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι [15] τέτυκται [16].

Here is a modified version of one of the most recent translations of the fragment:

And of course the clear and certain truth no man has seen,
nor will there be anyone who knows what I say concerning gods and
about the entire world.
For even if, in the best case among all men, one happened to speak just
of what the case is,
still he himself would not know [that he speaks the truth]; but opinion
is allotted to all.¹²

It is not my intention, of course, to discuss every scholarly disagreement on what Xenophanes really held on the problem of knowledge and how each word of these verses should be translated.¹³ The fewer the source-words available to

-
- 11 This is a full list of occurrences of τετελεσμένον in Homer: *Ilias* 1, 212; 11, 237–238; 257–258; VIII, 286; 401; 454; IX, 307–311; XIV, 196; XVIII, 4; 426–427; XXIII, 410; 672; *Odyssea* 11, 187; V, 89–90; XV, 536; XVI, 440; XVII, 163; 229; XVIII, 82; XIX, 309; 487; 547; XXI, 337. On the Homeric provenance of this Xenophanean word see, e.g., Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 158, n. 5; “Xenophanes’ Scepticism,” 19–20, n. 30 (= *Essays in Ancient*, 38, n. 30); Heitsch, “Das Wissen,” 227–28.
- 12 Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 39; id., “Early Interest in Knowledge,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy*, ed. Anthony A. Long (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 225–49, at 229. I would be inclined to adopt David Sider’s correction of Leshner’s translation (see the review in *American Journal of Philology* 115, 3 [1994]: 457–61, at 460). Further, I would be reluctant to share Leshner’s idea that the passage is closely connected with divination and that “τετελεσμένον” must be rendered as “what has been brought to pass” (cf. Daniel W. Graham, *The Texts of Early Greek Philosophy. The Complete Fragments and Selected Testimonies of the Major Presocratics*, 1 [New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010], 5; Alexander P.D. Mourelatos, “The Epistemological Section (29b–d) of the Proem in Timaeus’ Speech: M.F. Burnyeat on *eikōs mythos*, and Comparison with Xenophanes B34 and B35,” in *One Book. The Whole Universe: Plato’s Timaeus Today*, ed. Richard D. Mohr and Barbar M. Sattler [Las Vegas-Zurich-Athens: Parmenides, 2010], 225–47, at 246–47).
- 13 See on them André Rivier, “Remarques sur les fragments 34 et 35 de Xénophane,” *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d’histoire anciennes* 30, 1 (1956): 37–61; Ernst Heitsch, “Das Wissen des Xenophanes,” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 109, 1 (1966): 193–235, at 222–32; Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 161–69; Scott Lee Stearman, “The Epistemic Origins of Xenophanes’ Natural Theology” (PhD Diss., University of Oklahoma, 2002), 44–48;

us, the bigger the gaps we must fill in and, consequently, the more verbose our own interpretations.¹⁴ Let me make only one remark, which will prove useful later on (*infra*, 275; 371): almost definitively, the phrase ἐπὶ πάντι must not be translated as “over all things” or “on all issues,” as it is often rendered,¹⁵ but

-
- 54–86; Roberta Ioli, “Senofane B 34 e il conoscere,” *Giornale italiano di filologia* 55 (2003): 199–219; Gaetano Messina, *Dalla fisica di Senofane all’Empedocle di Strasburgo. Studi di filosofia presocratica* (Bari: Levante, 2007), 87–98. A sober account of the various versions is offered by Ernese Mogyórdi, “Xenophanes’ Epistemology and Parmenides’ Quest for Knowledge,” in *La costruzione del discorso filosofico nell’età dei Presocratici*, ed. Maria Michela Sassi (Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2006), 123–60, at 128–34.
- 14 Even v. 1 has been translated in various ways; see, e.g., one of the strangest translations in Felix M. Cleve, *The Giants of Pre-Socratic Philosophy. An Attempt to Reconstruct their Thoughts* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1965), 29–30: “This is quite certainly true . . .” As for the interpretation of the meaning of the fragment, it has even been argued that δόκος has a more positive than negative epistemological connotation – e.g., by Fernanda Decleva-Caizzi, “Senofane e il problema della conoscenza,” *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 102 (1974): 145–64 – and that there is not even the slightest bit of Scepticism in it at all; Shigeru Yonezawa, “Xenophanes: His Self-consciousness as a Wise Man and Fr. B34,” in *Ionian Philosophy*, ed. Konstantine I. Boudouris (Athens: Kardamitsa, 1989), 432–40. See also Eduard Zeller’s intriguing yet misleading translation of the “δόκος δ’ ἐπὶ πάντι τέτυκται” as “zu meinen ist allen beschieden” (*Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Erster Theil. Allgemeine Einleitung. Vorsokratische Philosophie* (Tübingen: Fues’s, 21856), 393, n. 2; “to have an opinion is free to all”; *A History of Greek Philosophy from the Earliest Period to the time of Socrates. With a General Introduction*, tr. Sarah Frances Alleyne, 1 (London: Longmans, 1881), 575, n. 2; cf. Arthur Fairbanks, *The First Philosophers of Greece* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Trübner, 1898), 71), which wrongly implies that what Xenophanes says is that everyone holds rather firmly his own beliefs to be more or less true.
- 15 See, e.g., Karsten, *Xenophanis*, 51; John Maxwell Edmonds, *Elegy and Iambus, Being the Remains of All the Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poets from Callinus to Crates, Excepting the Choliambic Writers, with the Anacreontea*, 1 (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1931), 211; Carlo Corbato, “Studi senofanei,” *Annali dell’Università di Trieste* 22 (1952): 179–244, at 221–22; Stelio Zeppi, *Protagora e la filosofia del suo tempo* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1961), 188–89; Rodolfo Mondolfo, *Il pensiero antico. Storia della filosofia greco-romana* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1961), 72; William Keith Chambers Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, 1, *The Earlier Presocratics and the Pythagoreans* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1962), 395; Leshner, “Xenophanes’ Scepticism,” 11; 14 (but not in id., *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 39; 155; 159); Richard Bett, *Sextus Empiricus. Against the Logicians* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 153; James Warren, *Presocratics* (Stocksfield: Acumen, 2007), 50; Heitsch, *Xenophanes*, 77; 183; cf. Charles H. Kahn, “Arius as a Doxographer,” in *The Works of Arius Didymus*, 1, *On Stoic and Peripatetic Ethics*, ed. William W. Fortenbaugh (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1983), 3–13, at 5; Christian Schäfer, “Los orígenes del pensamiento escéptico antiguo. El ‘pesimismo gnoseológico’ de los Presocráticos y su influencia en la filosofía antigua,” *Revista de filosofía* 22

“to all (men).”¹⁶ A parallel that, to my knowledge, has so far passed unnoticed, clearly points in this direction. In the *Posthomerica* of Quintus Smyrnaeus (second half of the 3rd cent. AD)¹⁷ at VI, 433–434, we read:

Οὐ [2] τι γὰρ ἄνδρες [4] ζώομεν ἥματα πάντα·
πότμος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται [15/16].

We mortal men don't live forever;
death is fated for us all.¹⁸

The unambiguous translation of the second clause, which is almost identical with the final clause of B34, convinces me that πᾶσι must be masculine. Both Xenophanes and Quintus, in Homeric fashion, lament every man's lack of the desirable yet inaccessible divine advantages, i.e., (certain and full) knowledge¹⁹ and immortality. Even if we cannot claim with certainty that Quintus is directly

(1999): 95–129, at 104; 108. See also the entry “Xenophanes” in Pierre Bayle's *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, IV (fifth edition; Amsterdam: P. Brunel, 1740; repr. Geneva: Slatkine, 1995), 515–25, at 523b: “[...] sur toutes les choses’”); Antonio Conti, *Illustrazione del “Parmenide” di Platone. Con una dissertazione preliminare* (Venice: Giambattista Pasquali, 1743), 24: “... E v'è opinion in tutte queste cose’”.

16 See, e.g., John Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy* (London: Black, 1930), 121; Leonardo Tarán, “El concepto de lo divino en Jenófanes,” *Philosophia. Revista del Instituto de Filosofía* 22 (1959): 10–25, at 18; Mario Untersteiner, *Senofane. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1955), CCXXV, n. 36; id., “Il problema del conoscere in Senofane,” *Sophia* 23, 1 (1955): 26–37, at 32, note 38; Aryeh Finkelberg, “Studies in Xenophanes,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 93 (1990): 103–67, at 132, n. 74, giving further bibliography; see even Brucker, *Historia critica*, I, 1154, 8: “... in omnibus adest tantum opinio.’”

17 See Alan James, *Quintus of Smyrna. The Trojan Epic. Posthomerica* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), xx–xxi; Manuel Baumbach and Silvio Bär, “An Introduction to Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*,” in *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic*, ed. Baumbach and Bär (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 1–26, at 6; Silvio Bär, *Quintus Smyrnaeus. “Posthomerica,”* 1, *Die Wiedergeburt des Epos aus dem Geiste der Amazonomachie. Mit einem Kommentar zu den Versen 1–219* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2009), 23.

18 Francis Vian, *Quintus de Smyrne. La suite d'Homère*, II, *Livres V–IX* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966), 84; tr. James, *Quintus of Smyrna*, 109. See also Arthur S. Way, *Quintus Smyrnaeus. The Fall of Troy* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1913; 1984), 285: “[...] each man's fate [...]”. Cf. Homer's *Iliad* III, 101–102: “ἡμέων δ' ὅπποτέρῳ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα τέτυκται τεθνάῃη” / “And for whichever of us twain death and fate are appointed, let him lie dead”; tr. Augustus Taber Murray, *Homer. The Iliad*, I (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1924; 1988), 125.

19 See, e.g., Shirley M. Darcus, “The Phren of the Noos in Xenophanes' God,” *Symbolae Osloenses* 53 (1978): 25–39, at 32–33.

imitating Xenophanes in this instance, the coincidence of phrasing resolves the problem of how to translate *πάνσι*.

Moreover, the phrase was construed in just this way in the two ancient doxographical sources that happen to be clear as to the meaning of the *ἐπὶ πάνσι*. This is the version of the fragment offered by Epiphanius of Salamis (ca. 315–403): εἶναι δὲ τὰ πάντα, ὡς ἔφη (sc. Xenophanes), οὐδὲν ἀληθές [...], δόκησις δὲ ἐπὶ πάνσι τέτυκται, μάλιστα τῶν ἀφανέων.²⁰ Indeed, if *ἐπὶ πάνσι* denoted the issues on which man tries to find out the truth, our source should not read τῶν ἀφανέων, but τοῖς ἀφανέσι. But, in fact, τῶν ἀφανέων is a *genitivus objectivus* adjunct to δόκησις (“Opinion is allotted to all, especially on the non-evident things”).²¹ Further, Arius Didymus, whose version of B34 is discussed below (283–286), contrasts παρὰ θεοῖς ὄν with ἀνθρώπινον χρήμα as well as θεός with ἐπὶ πάνσι, which means that he construed *πάνσι* as referring to the human beings.²²

Since this is the correct translation of *ἐπὶ πάνσι*, then πάντες (“all”) must be seen as a strong repetition of οὐ τις ἀνὴρ and οὐδὲ τις of v. 1. In this way, the defective status of human knowledge is presented as inherent to the human condition, and the implicit contrast between this mean knowledge and perfect divine knowledge²³ is sharpened. On the other hand, reading *ἐπὶ πάνσι* as I suggest means that Xenophanes’s scepticism (despite the radicalisation effected by *ἐπὶ πάνσι* as far as its roots are concerned) presents itself as more consistent in scope. For it is not πάντα that lie beyond human knowledge (this would amount to an absurd epistemological nihilism, which is not compatible with Xenophanes’s philosophy in general),²⁴ but only issues that are hard to resolve, namely, the questions ἀμφὶ θεῶν and περὶ πάντων (v. 2), matters that lie beyond ordinary evidence and reach (cf. the ἴδεν in v. 1).²⁵

20 Epiphanius of Salamis, *Adversus haereses*, “De fide” in Karl Holl, ed., *Epiphanius*, III (GCS 37; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs’sche, 1933), 505, 25–27. Cf. Stelio Zeppi, “Il pensiero di Senofane,” in id., *Studi sulla filosofia presocratica* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1962), 1–23, at 3, n. 2.

21 True, in Epiphanius’s “εἶναι δὲ τὰ πάντα, ὡς ἔφη, οὐδὲν ἀληθές,” “τὰ πάντα” obviously means “with regard to everything.” Still, these words paraphrase not v. 4, but vv. 1–2 (“τὸ σαφές [...] περὶ πάντων”).

22 This is not the case with Epiphanius’s reproduction of Metrodorus’s assimilation of B34 (see *infra*, 274); yet, this has to do with how Metrodorus, not Epiphanius, reproduced and/or interpreted B34.

23 See Xenophanes’s doctrine that the divine mind is not like man’s (B23–25; Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, I, 135, 3–9).

24 See, e.g., Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 161.

25 If I am right about the translation of *ἐπὶ πάνσι*, then Stearman’s optimistic or, at least, non-pessimistic reading of the entire B34 (“The Epistemic Origins,” 44–46; 68) is not sustainable. Stearman translates the “δόκος ἐπὶ πάνσι τέτυκται” as “opinion is given to all” (or “opinion is granted to all”) and renders the contrast “μὲν...δ” in the fragment as “on the

3 *Method: Criteria of Inclusion and Exclusion*

From the numerous passages found in extant Greek and Latin literature of Antiquity and Greek literature of the Middle Ages that present, at least *prima facie*, some affinity to B34, I select those that have one or more of the following features:

- (i) they are quotations or adaptations in the traditional sense of the term, i.e., they offer a version of B34 verbally very close to parts of the fullest extant version (in Sextus Empiricus: see *supra*, 246–247), whether or not explicit mention of Xenophanes's name occurs (Cases I.2; I.3; I.5; I.6, p. 263; I.7; I.11; I.12; I.15, p. 294; II.3; II.2; II.5, p. 327; II.6; II.7; II.8; III.1, p. 359; III.2; III.4; III.5.1; III.5.2);
- (ii) they explicitly argue for the imperfect, limited or deplorable character of the human knowledge in an 'internalist' way, i.e., from the fact that, even if one has objectively conceived of the truth, one is nevertheless unable to know that this is the case, thereby lacking τὸ σαφές (Cases I.2; I.6, p. 262; I.13; I.14, pp. 294–296; II.1; II.2; II.4; II.8; III.1, p. 359; III.5);
- (iii) they contrast 'clear knowledge' (as a privilege of the divine) with 'opinion' (taken either in an externalist way, i.e., as meaning 'partial truth' or truth mixed with falsehood, or in an internalist way, i.e., as meaning 'uncertain knowledge') as the best man can achieve in this life, normally using in this setting the lexeme σαφές (Cases I.1; I.4; I.6, pp. 264, 269 and 270, n. 87; I.7; I.8; I.9; I.10; I.11; I.12; I.13; I.14; II.3; II.4; II.5, p. 325; II.8; III.2; III.3; III.4; III.5.1; III.5.2).²⁶

Previous scholars used these criteria, if sometimes only implicitly, in researching the *Nachleben* of B34. Of course, sometimes Xenophanes's name itself is mentioned and connected with a dictum that is obviously identical with B34 or can be plausibly be traced back to it (see below cases I, 8; I, 9; III, 1). Besides, some passages meet more than one standard (I.2; I.7; I.11; I.13; I.14;

one hand ... on the other hand." The point is that, although clear knowledge lies beyond human reach, opinion is nevertheless something everybody can reach. Yet, ἐπὶ *cum dativo* cannot serve syntactically as an *objectum*: see, e.g., Raphael Kühner and Bernhard Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Part II, *Satzlehre*, I (Hannover: Hahn, 31898; repr. Darmstadt: WBG, 1963), § 438, 2, 2. Further, the kind of antithesis Stearman refers to (i.e., the mild antithesis between two opposite yet compatible things, with an emphasis on the fact that the latter clause of the antithesis is possible for all the reality of the former) cannot be expressed by μὲν ... δέ, but by ... ὅμως or ... ἀλλ' ὅμως et al.; see, e.g., Kühner and Gerth, §§ 527; 534.

26 To give some negative instances, see on Euripides and Lucian *infra*, 255, n. 37; 258, n. 43.

II.3; II.2; II.5; II.6; II.7; III.1; III.5.1; III.5.2), whereas some meet all of them (II.8; III.2; III.4). Needless to say, each case has its peculiarities, which are discussed in turn.

Part I: The Reception of Xenophanes's B34 in pre-Christian and non-Christian Ancient Literature

1 *Alcmaeon of Croton*

According to an old suggestion by Karl Reinhardt,²⁷ which has been widely accepted by scholars,²⁸ Xenophanes's B34 is the direct basis of fr. B1, ll. 3–5, of the lost *On Nature I* by Alcmaeon of Croton (second half of the 6th–first half of the 5th century BC):²⁹

-
- 27 Karl Reinhardt, *Parmenides und die Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie* (Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1916), 118, n. 1. Cf. Hermann Fränkel, "Xenophanesstudien," *Hermes* 60 (1925): 174–92; partial translation by Matthew R. Cosgrove and Alexander P.D. Mourelatos: H. Fränkel, "Xenophanes' Empiricism and His Critique of Knowledge," in *The Presocratics. A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Alexander P.D. Mourelatos (New York: Anchor Doubleday, 1974), 118–31, at 190, n. 7.
- 28 See, *inter alios*, Hermann Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums. Eine Geschichte der griechischen Epik, Lyrik und Prosa bis zum Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Beck, 1951), 387–88 (= *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy. A History of Greek Epic, Lyric, and Prose to the Middle of the Fifth Century*, tr. Moses Hadas and James Willis [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975], 340); Geoffrey S. Kirk, John E. Raven and Malcolm Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers. Second Edition* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 179; John A. Palmer, *Plato's Reception of Parmenides* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 25, n. 16.
- 29 On dating see the *Forschungsbericht* offered in the quite recent entry by Carl Huffman (par. 1.3) in Edward N. Zalta, ed., *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2013 Edition)*, URL <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2013/entries/alcmaeon> (accessed August, 29, 2013). Laura Gemmelli Marciano suggests a different translation, which, if correct, turns Alcmaeon's lines from a general declaration of the limits of human knowledge to a declaration regarding "the interior of the body and invisible maladies" which "addresses medical students" (Huffman, par. 2.1): "Concerning things that are not perceptible concerning mortals the gods have clarity, but in so far as it is possible for human beings to judge..." ("Lire du début," *Philosophie antique* 17 [2007]: 7–37, at 19–22; tr. from Gemmelli Marciano's French translation by Huffman). This translation is in principle syntactically possible yet renders the original text stylistically awkward – at least, not less awkward than the traditional translation. To get the meaning suggested by Gemmelli Marciano, the text should read: 'Περὶ τῶν ἀφανέων τῶν θνητῶν...' It is almost certain that the fragment suffers from corruption.

“Περὶ τῶν ἀφανέων {1 *e contrario*}, περὶ τῶν θνητῶν σαφήνειαν [1] μὲν θεοὶ ἔχοντι, ὥς δὲ ἀνθρώποις [4] τεκμαίρεσθαι” καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

Of things invisible, as of mortal things, only the gods have certain knowledge; but to us, as men, only inference from evidence is possible.³⁰

Although the verbal coincidence is not strong, Reinhardt's suggestion is not improbable. This reading – or simply the use – of Xenophanes's verses accords with the traditional mythical and religious contrast between human ignorance and divine knowledge. As will be seen (below, 281–298; 306–351), such a reading would recur in the Late Classical as well as in the Greco-Roman period, and would find favour among Christians, who were fond of stressing the superiority of their unique God in terms, *inter alia*, of His perfect knowledge. Still, the tenor of Alcmaeon's fragment is not pessimistic throughout. As has been plausibly argued, Alcmaeon's lines say that “the gods have knowledge about matters that are removed from human observation, yet mortals have the capacity to learn at least some things on their own by ‘inferring from signs.’”³¹

To judge from the version of B34 preserved by Epiphanius of Salamis (see *supra*, 250), it seems that these lines by Alcmaeon had in some way been connected with B34 in the doxographical tradition in the Antiquity; indeed, this version reads: Δόκησις δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται, μάλιστα τῶν ἀφανέων (cf. Alcmaeon's Περὶ τῶν ἀφανέων . . .).

2 Protagoras

It is not unlikely³² that the exordium of the lost treatise *On Gods* by Protagoras (born ca. 490 BC) partly echoes Xenophanes's B34:

- 30 Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, I, 214, 25–27 (= Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* VIII, 83 in Miroslav Marcovich, ed., *Diogenis Laertii Vitae philosophorum*, I, *Libri I–X* [Stuttgart: de Gruyter, 1999], 623, 3–5); tr. Robert Drew Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, II (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1925; 101995), 397.
- 31 Leshner, “The Humanizing,” 469–70. See also id., *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 168; Herbert Granger, “Poetry and Prose: Xenophanes of Colophon,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 137 (2007): 403–433, at 423.
- 32 See, *inter alios*, Zeppi, *Protagora*, 188; id., “Senofane antiionico e presofista,” in Zeppi, *Studi*, 42; George Kerferd, *The Sophistic Movement* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 163–4; Carl Joachim Classen, “Protagoras' *Aletheia*” in *The Criterion of Truth. Essays Written in Honour of G. Kerferd together with a Text and Translation (with Annotations) of Ptolemy's “On the Kriterion and Hegemonikon,”* ed. Pamela Huby and George Neal (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1988), 13–38, at 31, n. 29.

Περὶ μὲν θεῶν [8] οὐκ ἔχω εἰδέναι [7], οὔθ' ὥς εἰσὶν οὔθ' ὥς οὐκ εἰσὶν, οὔθ' ὅποιοί
 τινες ἰδέαν· πολλὰ γὰρ τὰ κωλύοντα εἰδέναι [7], ἢ τ' ἀδηλότης {1 *e contrario*}
 καὶ βραχύς ὢν ὁ βίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου {4}.

Concerning the gods I am unable to discover whether they exist or not, or what they are like in form; for there are many hindrances to knowledge, the obscurity of the subject and the brevity of human life.³³

Protagoras's agnosticism is not identical with Xenophanes's scepticism. Nonetheless, some common ground for what they say does exist. Referring to the problem of divine existence and nature, both Presocratics not only deny man the possibility of a clear perception of the truth about it, but also deem this impossibility to be insurmountable (οὐδὲ . . . ἔσται εἰδῶς" / "οὐκ ἔχω εἰδέναι). Further, Protagoras, like Xenophanes (τὸ σαφές; ἴδεν), accounts for this impossibility by appealing to the lack of evidence (ἀδηλότης vs. ἰδέα) about the gods' existence and nature. Xenophanes's characteristic argument – that even he who has found the truth is nevertheless ignorant of the very fact that he has found it (vv. 3–4) – does not occur in Protagoras, yet it is not incompatible with Protagoras's argument from the non-evident character of the subject matter and the brevity of the human life. Even more, it seems that something connects the two arguments. Both Xenophanes (τις ἀνὴρ; αὐτός) and Protagoras (οὐκ ἔχω), although they declare universal ignorance of the truth about divine matters, focus on what an individual³⁴ is able or unable to know. Protagoras does not deny that someone might have gotten the truth on this issue; rather, he says that, besides the objective difficulty inherent in the task of getting truth, no one has sufficient time to clear it up and make sure that the research was successful. In sum, Protagoras stated the limited nature of each individual's knowledge of the divine, whereas Xenophanes had stated the uncertainty and

33 Protagoras, B4 (ed. H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, II [Berlin: Weidmann, 1952; repr. Dublin: Weidmann, 1966], 265, 7–9); tr. William Keith Chambers Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, III, *The Fifth-Century Enlightenment* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 234.

34 On Xenophanes see Leshner, *Xenophanes*, 229; John Philippousis, "The Gnoseological and Metaphysical Particularity of Xenophanes" in Boudouris, *Ionian Philosophy*, 327–36, at 330.

limitedness of all persons' views of the divine (including his own³⁵).³⁶ That these two statements are interchangeable is quite possible.

Furthermore, Protagoras presumably knew both Xenophanes's celebrated B34 and the fact that B34 was by then quite familiar in philosophical circles. Thus, it would be rather absurd to assume that it was only by coincidence that Protagoras opened his work on gods with a clause that would no doubt make its readers recall Xenophanes. Rather, it is much more plausible to think that he purposefully echoed B34, which means that he believed Xenophanes's view of the limits of the human knowledge of the divine had something in common with his own agnosticism.³⁷

-
- 35 See Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 166–67 (that Xenophanes's B34 implicitly excludes its own author is – rather unconvincingly – argued in Jürgen Wiesner, “Wissen und Skepsis bei Xenophanes,” *Hermes* 125, 1 (1997): 17–33, at 24); Daniel Babut, “Sur la ‘théologie’ de Xénophane,” *Revue Philosophique* 164 (1974): 401–40 (= id., *Parerga. Choix d'articles de Daniel Babut (1974–1994)* [Lyon 1994], 47–86, at 438). Varro (see *infra*, 281–282) testifies to the interpretation that Xenophanes did not exempt himself from the limitedness of the human cognitive powers.
- 36 This proposal seems to bridge the gap between Xenophanes and Protagoras posed by Guthrie (*A History*, 234; id., *The Sophists* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971], 234) on the basis of Protagoras's ‘man the measure’ principle. Xenophanes, we are told, relativizes the knowledge of all people, whereas Protagoras makes a suspending judgment only for his own part. Yet, Protagoras's account of his ignorance of the truth on the divine holds in all cases; for, objective obscurity and the hard fact of the brevity of life holds equally for all people. As will be seen later (see *infra*, 372), Gregory Palamas probably thought that Xenophanes's Scepticism and Protagoras's agnosticism virtually coincided.
- 37 Another author of Sophistic spirit, Euripides (ca. 480–406 BC), has been seen as reflecting some of Xenophanes's ideas. *Helena*, vv. 1148–50 has been paralleled with B34; see, e.g., Franziska Egli, *Euripides im Kontext zeitgenössischer intellektueller Strömungen. Analyse der Funktion philosophischen Themen in den Tragödien und Fragmenten* (Munich: K.G. Saur, 2003), 77–78; 133–34, with a parallelism to Protagoras's B4 as well. These verses presumably express Euripides's conviction that man is not able to discover the full truth: “Οὐδ’ ἔχω τί τὸ σαφές [1] ὅτι ποτ’ ἐν βροτοῖς {4; 15} τὸ τῶν θεῶν ἔπος ἀλαθές {1} εὔρον”. Similar to this is fr. 391 from Euripides's lost *Thyestes*, preserved in Theophilus of Antioch's *Ad Autolycum* II, 8, 6: “Οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν χωρὶς ἀνθρώποις {4; 15} θεῶν· σπουδάζομεν δὲ πᾶλλ’ ὑπ’ ἐλπίδων, μάτην πόνους ἔχοντες, οὐδὲν εἰδότες [7] σαφές [1]” (in Augustus Nauck, ed., *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta. Editio secunda* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1889; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1964], 480; cf. Miroslav Marcovich, *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos. Theophili Antiocheni Ad Autolycum* [PTS 43/44; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995], 51; Nicole Zeegers-Vander Vorst, “Les citations poétiques chez Théophile d’Antioque. Contrastes entre la culture classique de Théophile et celle des apologistes grecs du second siècle,” *Studia Patristica* 10 [1970]: 168–74, at 170, n. 2; see also Orion [5th century AD], *Anthologion* 5, 7, in Friedrich Schneidewin, *Coniectanea critica*

3 *Aristophanes*

In 424/3 BC, the *Clouds*, one of the most famous comedies by Aristophanes (ca. 445–ca. 386 BC), was performed in Athens. Later, between 420 and 417 BC,

[Göttingen: Libreria Dieterichiana, 1839], 47, 18–20). Still, this “οὐδὲν εἰδότες σαφές” can be satisfactorily explained in the context of the Homeric tradition (see *supra*, n. 10; see also Ioli, “Senofane B 34,” 209; 213; Karl Deichgräber, “Xenophanes περὶ φύσεως,” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 87 [1938]: 1–31, at 22–25), in which man cannot predict the future and thereby is unable to govern his own life, always standing in need of some help from gods. Besides, as is obvious, these verses do not exhibit any interest in gnoseological matters. Euripides seems to reproduce Theognis’s *Elegiae* I, ll. 159–60 and 585–86: “Μήποτε, Κύρν’, ἀγοράσθαι ἔπος μέγα· οἶδε γὰρ οὐδείς ἀνθρώπων ὃ τι νύξ’ ἡμέρη ἀνδρὶ τελεῖ. Πᾶσιν τοι κίνδυνος ἐπ’ ἔργμασιν, οὐδέ τις οἶδεν πῇ στήσιν μέλλει πρήγματος ἀρχομένου” (Douglas Young *post* Ernst Diehl, ed., *Theognis. Ps.-Pythagoras. Ps.-Phocylides. Chares. Anonymi Aulodia. Fragmentum teliambicum* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1971], 11; 37). In general, many of Euripides’s tragedies, such as the extant *Hercules* (ll. 1341–46) and the lost *Autolycus* (fr. 282), are also in tune with Xenophanes’s views on the divine as well as on various other issues: see Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* X, 5–6, in Georg Kaibel, *Athenaei Naucratis Deipnosophistarum libri xv*, 11 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1887; repr. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1985), 400–401; Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Euripides. Herakles. Text und Commentar* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1889), 278; Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, I, 139 (C1; C2); Godfrey W. Bond, *Euripides. Heracles. With Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 400. Still, what is absent in Euripides – and this lack means that he just traditionally stresses human ignorance in contrast to divine knowledge – is Xenophanes’s justification of the limits of the human knowledge (impossibility of attaining certainty even when truth is found; difficulties in reaching things remote). Even more, in fr. 391, in spite of the fact that elsewhere (*Supplices* 201–215) it seems that the content of B18 is implicitly reproduced (see Fränkel, *Dichtung*, 380), it is said that men can achieve nothing without gods, which directly goes against Xenophanes’s B18 (Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 26). So, I would be reluctant to see in any of the above Euripidean passages some real echo of B34. It would be tempting to accept Leshner’s suggestion (*Xenophanes of Colophon*, 157) that B34 was deliberately echoed by Aristotle in his negative account of Xenophanes’s theory of the unity of being, an account that put Xenophanes at the top of the list of those who had claimed the universe (“περὶ τοῦ παντός”; cf. B34, v. 2: “περὶ πάντων”) is a single entity; see Aristotle, *Metaphysics* I, 5, 10–12, 986b10–11; 21–23, elaborating on Plato’s *Sophist* 242D: “... ἐνὸς ὄντος τῶν πάντων καλούμενων...” (John A. Palmer, “Xenophanes’ Ouranian God in the Fourth Century,” *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 16 [1998]: 1–34, at 1–2) aphoristically says that “Ξενοφάνης [...] οὐθὲν διεσαφήνισεν...” (cf. B34, v. 1: “τὸ [...] σαφές οὐ [...] οὐδέ...”). True, Aristotle’s words mean that Xenophanes “gave no clear statement” (tr. William David Ross, *The Works of Aristotle Translated into English*. Vol. VIII: *Metaphysica*, 2nd edition [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1928]) on what unity meant for him; still, this is not far from saying that Xenophanes did not achieve a clear conception of the universe and its unity. If we assume that B34 was well known in the 4th-century philosophical circles, then Aristotle’s selection of the above words might have sounded ironic to his readers.

it took the form in which it has come down to us.³⁸ Some of the opening words of a celebrated part of this comedy – the episode of the uneducated Strepsiades's initiation into Socrates's school (ll. 217–501) – mock Socrates. The teacher is bitterly caricatured as a mixture of the pre-Socratic naturalists, who had audaciously set out to demystify the universe by revealing its secrets without having recourse to myth, and the Sophists, who arrogantly claimed that their knowledge was by far superior to that of average men. In the dialogue between Socrates and Strepsiades, Aristophanes puts these words in the philosopher's mouth:

Βούλει τὰ θεῖα [8] πράγματ' εἰδέναι [7] σαφῶς [1] ἄττ' [9] ἐστὶν ὁρθῶς;

Would you like to know the clear truth about matters divine, what they really are?³⁹

The striking verbal similarities between this and B34⁴⁰ render it highly probable that they represent Aristophanes's deliberate use of Xenophanes's lines. Given that Aristophanes, of all his contemporary fellow playwrights, was probably the best versed in and most focused on philosophical figures and ideas,⁴¹ this usage does not come as a surprise. Because Xenophanes had used dactylic hexameter, whereas Aristophanes used iambic trimeter, B34 could not be reproduced verbatim. Still, it seems that Aristophanes took some pains to preserve as much as possible from the first two lines of B34; he reproduced even Xenophanes's ἄσσα (in the Attic form of the word, of course, i.e. ἄττα), which was not essential for the content of his lines.

What was Aristophanes's intention? Presumably, he intended to underscore Socrates's arrogance. Socrates advertises his alleged wisdom to his would-be student in a way that flagrantly scorns Xenophanes's sober warning against

38 See Kenneth J. Dover, *Aristophanes. The Clouds* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), lxxx–xcviii.

39 Aristophanes, *Clouds* 250–1 (Dover, *Aristophanes*, 19). Cf. *Aristophane*, I, *Les Acharniens – Les Cavaliers – Les Nuées*, ed. Victor Coulon; tr. Hilaire Van Daele (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1923; ¹¹1980), 174; tr. Jeffrey Henderson, *Aristophanes. Clouds – Wasps – Peace* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 41 (slightly modified).

40 James H. Leshner, “Plato's View of Xenophanes” (a lecture available at: <http://philosophy.unc.edu/people/faculty/james-lesher>; accessed at October 3, 2012), where this parallel is noted.

41 See Chris Carey, “Old Comedy and the Sophists,” in *Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, ed. David Harvey and John Wilkins (London: Duckworth, 2000), 419–36, at 429–31.

the limits of human reasoning; Aristophanes expresses the philosopher's self-assertion by reproducing the *ipsissima verba* of Xenophanes's modesty, but with a simple omission of Xenophanes's οὐ (vv. 1; 4). Still more cutting, Socrates lacks even the naïve sense of self-limitedness that Strepsiades expresses in his reply: Νῆ Δ' ἔῃπερ ἐστί γε ("I certainly would, *if it is actually possible* [for a human being to know these things]").⁴² Apparently, Aristophanes assumed that some of the spectators or readers of his play would recognize his allusion to Xenophanes's verses. He also stressed the extreme self-confidence of the *persona* of Socrates theatrically, by having him lifted up in the air as he expressly condemns those who, as mere "creatures of a day," live on the ground.⁴³

Aristophanes also seems to reflect Protagoras's echo of Xenophanes's B34 (see *supra*, 253–255) along with B34 itself in the discussion between Socrates and Strepsiades about the nature of the Socratic deities, i.e. the Clouds. Socrates asks his disciple: Ποῖαι γὰρ τινές εἰσιν; ("What do they look like?"), which is very close to the way Protagoras had put the second of the two major theological issues (i.e. whether gods exist and what their 'form' or nature is): Περὶ [...] θεῶν... ὅποιοί τινες ἰδέαν. The inept disciple replies: Οὐκ οἶδ' αὖ σαφῶς ('I don't know exactly'),⁴⁴ which sounds as though it might be an echo both of

42 Aristophanes, *Clouds* 251 (Dover, *Aristophanes*, 19); tr. Henderson, *Aristophanes. Clouds*, 41. Cf. Dover's comment *ad loc.* (*Aristophanes*, 130).

43 Aristophanes, *Clouds* 226–228 (Dover, *Aristophanes*, 18). Aristophanes's pejorative use of 'χαμαι' for denoting the place of the human beings, in contrast to the divine beings, whose place is (like Socrates's place) the heavens, goes back to Homer (*Ilias* v, 441–442; cf. the Pseudo-Homeric hymn *In Vestam*, l. 2, in Thomas W. Allen, William R. Halliday, Edward E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 21936], 85, and Hesiod's *Theogonia* 272, in *Hesiodi Theogonia – Opera et Dies – Scutum. Edidit F. Solmsen. Fragmenta Selecta. Ediderunt R. Merkelbach and M.L. West* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970], 16). This contrast ("ἐπὶ γῆς βεβηκότες" and "χαμαὶ ἐρχόμενοι" vs. "ὥσπερ ἐκ τῶν ἀστέρων καταπεσόντες") is used by Lucian in an argument that loosely reflects the argument of Xenophanes's B34. In a writing whose very title looks like a nod to Aristophanes's *Nubes*, i.e., the *Icaromenippus* (*Ἰκαρομένιππος ἢ ὑπερνήφελος*), Lucian castigates the natural philosophers for being not only so daring as to try to discover what is practically impossible for any human being to discover (*Icaromenippus* 6, in Matthew Donald Macleod, *Luciani opera*, 1 [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972], 293, 5–18) but also for being so arrogant as to contend that what they say about these obscure matters ("περὶ τῶν οὕτως ἀδήλων λέγοντες") is not just an opinion ("εἰχάζοντες") but the very truth, which leaves no room for any other idea to be held as true (op. cit. 7, in Macleod, op. cit., 293, 19–26). This position seems to echo Xenophanes's two-fold critique of human theories about high natural issues, i.e., Xenophanes points out both the difficulty of the subject matter itself and the uncertainty inherent in any theory. Still, there is no verbal similarity to suggest that Lucian drew on or even hinted at B34.

44 Aristophanes, *Clouds* 342–43 (Dover, *Aristophanes*, 24–25; tr. Henderson, *Aristophanes*, 55).

Protagoras's οὐκ ἔχω εἰδέναι (see *supra*, 254) and of Xenophanes's τὸ [...] σαφές οὐ τις ἀνὴρ ἴδεν οὐδέ τις ἔσται εἰδώς ἀμφὶ θεῶν (see *supra*, 246). This echo presumably implies that Aristophanes intended to depict Socrates holding a dull, optimistic view of his own capacity to know the world by neglecting some well-known warnings on the limits of human nature. Besides, Socrates addresses his disciple by calling him ἐφήμερος ('a temporary being'),⁴⁵ intimating that he himself is superior to ordinary men⁴⁶ in being free from the restrictions posed by "the brevity of human life" pointed out by Protagoras (see *supra*, 254).

4 *Pseudo-Hippocrates*

Another echo of B34 occurs in the opening chapter of Pseudo-Hippocrates's *De prisca medicina* (dating from late 5th or early 4th century BC).⁴⁷ Since this is probably the earliest relativisation of truth-value in propositions from the natural sciences and arts – a relativisation which, as we will see (358–361; 383–395), was promptly reproduced by some Byzantine thinkers – I quote Pseudo-Hippocrates's lines in full:

‘Οκόσοι ἐπεχείρησαν περὶ [10] ἱητρικῆς λέγειν [9] [...], ἐν πολλοῖσι μὲν καὶ οἷσι λέγουσι [9] καταφενέες εἰσὶν ἀμαρτάνοντες [12 and 16 *e contrario*]. [...] “Ὡσπερ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τεχνῶν πασέων οἱ δημιουργοὶ πολλὸν ἀλλήλων διαφέρουσι κατὰ χεῖρα καὶ κατὰ γνώμην, οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐπὶ ἱητρικῆς. Διὸ οὐκ ἤξιουν ἔγωγε κενῆς

45 Aristophanes, *Clouds* 223 (Dover, *Aristophanes*, 18). To the parallels with earlier occurrences of this word noticed by Dover (*Aristophanes*, 125–26), one can add Empedocles's B131 (l. 1: 'ἐφημερίων ἔνεκέν τιος'; in Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*. 1, 364, 17), which is an invocation to Muse to enable the author to produce a correct statement 'about gods' ('ἀμφὶ θεῶν'; Empedocles, B131, l. 4, in Diels and Kranz, 365, 3). The coincidence of this phrase with Xenophanes's B34, l. 2 has been noticed by Giovanni Cerri, "Poemi greci arcaici sulla natura e rituali misterici: Senofane, Parmenide, Empedocle," *Mediterraneo antico* 3, 2 (2000): 603–19, at 604. As far as I was able to check, this coincidence is unique in ancient Greek literature.

46 Evidence that Socrates was thought to possess extraordinary qualities occurs both in Aristophanes's *Clouds* and in some of Plato's writings: see Angus M. Bowie, *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 112–24.

47 Fränkel, "Xenophanesstudien," 191; cf. Hermann Fränkel, *Wege und Formen Frühgriechischen Denkens*, ed. Franz Tietze (Munich: Beck, 1960), 338–49. Fränkel, "Xenophanesstudien," 191, n. 1, acknowledges that this parallel was pointed out to him by Max Pohlenz. Cf. Jonathan Barnes, *The Presocratic Philosophers*. Vol. 1 (New York: Routledge, 1979; 1982), 139–40; Palmer, *Plato's Reception*, 25; Jacques Jouanna, *Hippocrate*, 11, 1, *De l'ancienne médecine* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1990), 158–59, n. 6. On dating, see *ibid.*, 85.

αὐτέην ὑποθέσιος δέεσθαι, ὥσπερ τὰ ἀφανέα τε καὶ ἀπορεόμενα· *περί* [10] ὧν ἀνάγκη, ἣν τις ἐπιχειροίη λέγειν [9], ὑποθέσει χρέεσθαι, οἷον *περί* τῶν μετεώρων ἢ τῶν ὑπὸ γῆν {10}· ἀ εἴ τις [3] λέγοι [9] καὶ γινώσκοι {5; 7} ὡς ἔχει, οὔτ' ἂν αὐτέω [13] τῷ λέγοντι [9] οὔτε τοῖσιν ἀκούουσι δῆλα {1} ἂν εἴη, εἴτε ἀληθεῖα {1} ἐστὶν εἴτε μή· οὐ γὰρ ἔστι πρὸς ὃ τι χρὴ ἐπανενέγκαντα εἰδέναι [7] τὸ σαφές [1].

All who have attempted to speak of medicine [...], obviously blunder in many of their statements. [...]. Just as in all other arts the workers vary much in skill and in knowledge, so also is it in the case of medicine. Wherefore I have deemed that it should not have the air of an empty postulate, as do insoluble mysteries, about which any exponent must use a postulate, for example, about the things in the sky or below the earth. If a man were to learn and declare the state of these, neither to the speaker himself nor to his audience would it be clear whether his statements were true or not. For there is no test the application of which would give certainty.⁴⁸

Still, Pseudo-Hippocrates does not take the position of a Sceptic here; what he rejects is any medical theory or treatment based on propositions about hidden things. By beginning with such a rejection, he presumably intended to stress that he meant to replace such arbitrary theories with theories consisting of verifiable statements, and based on empirical grounds.⁴⁹

5 *Thucydides*

Hermann Fränkel,⁵⁰ in the course of his peculiar interpretation of Xenophanes's B34, has drawn a parallel to the following line from the *History* of Thucydides (ca. 460/455–ca. 395 BC):

Ἥγούμεθα γὰρ τό τε θεῶν [8] δόξῃ {14}, τὸ ἀνθρώπῳ δὲ σαφῶς [1]...

For of the gods we hold belief, and of men we know...⁵¹

48 Pseudo-Hippocrates, *De prisca medicina* 1, 1; 3 (ed. Jouanna, 118, 1–7; 119, 1–11); tr. William Henry Samuel Jones, *Hippocrates*, 1 (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1923; 1995), 13–15 (slightly corrected).

49 See Finkelberg, “Studies in Xenophanes,” 135, n. 84.

50 Fränkel, *Dichtung*, 382, n. 20 (= *Early Greek*, 335, n. 20).

51 Thucydides, *Historiae* v, 105, 2, in Henry Stuart Jones and John Enoch Powell, ed., *Thucydides Historiae. Tomus posterior* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), 104, 10–11; tr. Charles Forster Smith, *Thucydides, with an English Translation*, 111, *History of the Peloponnesian*

The setting of this line is as follows: the Athenians, just before launching their attack on the Melians, hold an official discussion with them in order to convince them to surrender and avoid disaster. The Melians refuse to be convinced. One of the Melians's arguments is that the *numen* (τὸ θεῖον) would support them, because they, in combatting unjust people (οὐ δίκαιοι), are on the right side (δῖοι), and that they reasonably expect to be supported by Spartans as well. The Athenians refute this argument by saying that their own conjectural knowledge of how gods behave (ἀνθρωπεία ἐς τὸ θεῖον νόμισις) and their certain knowledge of how humans behave both point in the opposite direction. Both gods and humans obey the law of self-interest and do not intervene against a more powerful force that threatens one less powerful, because the threat, however unjust it may seem to the victim, is dictated by an objective necessity specific to the powerful, that is, they must exercise their power.

The Sophistic air of the moral theory in this reply has been repeatedly noticed.⁵² Equally Sophistic is the implicitly expressed view that humans' knowledge of the divine (πρὸς τὸ θεῖον / "with regard to the divine...")⁵³ is confined to simple guess. Still, the Thucydidean wording (δόξα vs. σαφῶς) is indeed more Xenophanean than, e.g., Protagorean. Likewise, another expression of the Athenians, ἐκ τοῦ εἰκότος ('having good reason to')⁵⁴ has its correspondent in Xenophanes's B35, where the lexeme of δόξα reappears: ταῦτα δεδοξάσθω μὲν εἰκότα τοῖς ἐτύμοισιν ("Let these be accepted, certainly, as like the realities").⁵⁵

War, Books v and vi (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 167. Contrary to the traditional view that Thucydides wrote his *History* during his twenty-year exile (late 5th cent. BC), Mark Munn, *The School of History: Athens in the Age of Socrates* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 310–23, argues that Thucydides must have written it in 396/95 BC.

52 See, e.g., Wilhelm Nestle, "Thukydides und die Sophistik," in id., *Griechische Studien. Untersuchungen zur Religion, Dichtung und Philosophie der Griechen* (Stuttgart: H.F.C. Hannsman, 1958), 321–73; Simon Hornblower, *Thucydides* (London: Duckworth, 1987), 20; 28; 84–87; Kerferd, *The Sophistic Movement*, 112; Felix Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis. Herkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts* (Darmstadt: WGB, 1972), 166–67; Arnold Wycombe Gomme, Antony Andrewes, Kenneth James Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, IV, *Books v 25–vii* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), 173–74; Simon Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, III, *Books 5.25–8.109* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 244. Of course, some disagreement as to how far the Athenian reply reflects Sophistic ideas and, even more, to what extent such ideas reflect Thucydides's views, does exist among scholars.

53 Thucydides, *Historiae* v, 105, 3; tr. Forster Smith, *Thucydides*, 169.

54 Thucydides, *ibid.*; tr. Forster Smith, *ibid.*

55 Tr. Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 39.

6 *Plato*

According to a suggestion by Fränkel⁵⁶ almost unanimously accepted by scholarship,⁵⁷ Xenophanes's B34 is echoed in a well-known passage from the *Meno* (80D5–8) by Plato (ca. 419–ca. 347 BC), a work written in 386/5 BC.⁵⁸

Καὶ τίνα τρόπον ζητήσεις, ὦ Σώκρατες, τοῦτο ὃ μὴ οἶσθα τὸ παράπαν ὃ τι ἐστίν; Ποῖον γὰρ ὦν οὐκ οἶσθα προθέμενος ζητήσεις; – Ἡ εἰ καὶ ὃ τι μάλιστα ἐντύχοις αὐτῷ, πῶς εἴσῃ ὅτι τοῦτό ἐστιν ὃ σὺ οὐκ ᾔδησθα;

Along what lines will you look, Socrates, for a thing of whose nature you know nothing at all? Pray, what sort of thing, amongst those that you know not, will you treat us to as the object of your search? Or even supposing, at the best, that you hit upon it, how will you know it is the thing you did not know?⁵⁹

The notion expressed here, that a man needs to have an already established point or criterion if he is to acquire further knowledge, appeared above in the last sentence of the passage I quoted from the pseudo-Hippocratic treatise (οὐ γὰρ ἔστι πρὸς ὃ τι χρὴ ἐπανενέγκαντα εἰδέναι τὸ σαφές; *supra*, 260). This similarity brings B34 and its echoes in Pseudo-Hippocrates and Plato even closer to each other.

Nonetheless, James H. Lesher⁶⁰ has expressed some reservations about the extent to which these Platonic lines can be construed as really relevant to B34. Indeed, Socrates, in his reply to Meno (*Meno* 80E1–5), says that he recognises this argument, which he calls “eristic,” and he describes it as aimed at refuting from the outset the very possibility that a man might acquire any knowledge at all. So, what is really common between B34 and this argument in the *Meno* can be reduced to the trivial idea that for knowledge to deserve its name, its content must be justified in the eyes of the knower. Further, since this argument against the possibility of knowledge is presented with a sophistic air,⁶¹

56 Fränkel, “Xenophanesstudien. II,” 186, n. 2.

57 See, *inter alios*, Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, I, 137; Palmer, *Plato's Reception*, 23–25; Dominic Scott, *Plato's Meno* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 84.

58 See Richard Stanley Bluck, *Plato's Meno* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 118.

59 Translation (slightly modified) by Walter Rangeley Maitland Lamb, *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, II, *Laches – Protagoras – Meno – Euthydemus* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1924; ¹⁶1990), 299.

60 Lesher, *Xenophanes of Colophon*.

61 On Plato's equation of sophistic with contentiousness see Alexander Nehamas, “Eristic, Antilogic, Sophistic, Dialectic: Plato's Demarcation of Philosophy from Sophistry,” *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 7, 1 (1990): 3–16.

the most one can claim with regard to a possible Xenophanean influence on the Platonic text is that Xenophanes's strong demand that knowledge must be well-founded was received by some Sophists (cf. the case of Protagoras above, 253–255) and turned into an argument for the impossibility of knowledge, and that, in turn, is the argument Plato expounded in *Meno* in order to refute it (81D5–6) by defining knowledge as reminiscence.

Regardless, as has also been noted, again by Leshner,⁶² another celebrated Platonic passage, *Phaedo* 85C1–D4, does include an implicit quotation of B34:

Ἐμοὶ γὰρ δοκεῖ, ὦ Σώκρατες, περὶ τῶν τοιούτων {10} [sc. the divine things] ἴσως ὥσπερ καὶ σοί⁶³ τὸ μὲν σαφές [1] εἰδέναι [5/7] ἐν τῷ νῦν βίῳ ἢ ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἢ παγχάλεπόν τι, τὸ μέντοι αὖ τὰ λεγόμενα [9] περὶ [10a] αὐτῶν {10b} μὴ οὐχὶ παντὶ τρόπῳ ἐλέγχειν καὶ μὴ προαφίστασθαι πρὶν ἂν πανταχῇ σκοπῶν {12} ἀπείπῃ τις, πάνυ μαλθακοῦ εἶναι ἀνδρός· δεῖν γὰρ περὶ [10a] αὐτὰ {10b} ἐν γέ τι τούτων διαπράξασθαι, ἢ μαθεῖν ὅπῃ ἔχει ἢ εὑρεῖν ἢ, εἰ ταῦτα ἀδύνατον, τὸν γοῦν βέλτιστον {12} τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων {4} λόγων [9] λαβόντα καὶ δυσεξελεγκτότατον,⁶⁴ ἐπὶ τούτου ὀχοῦμενον ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σχεδίας κινδυνεύοντα διαπλεῦσαι τὸν βίον, εἰ μὴ τις δύναιτο ἀσφαλέστερον καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον ἐπὶ βεβαιότερου ὀχλήματος ἢ λόγου θείου τινός διαπορευθῆναι.

I think, Socrates, as perhaps you do yourself, that it is either impossible or very difficult 'to acquire clear knowledge' 'about' these matters in this life. And yet he is a weakling who does not test in every way "what is said about them" and persevere until he is worn out by studying them on every side. For he must do one of two things: either he must learn or discover the truth about these matters, or if that is impossible, he must take whatever human doctrine is best and hardest to disprove and, embarking upon it as upon a raft, sail upon it through life in the midst of dangers,

62 Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 157, note 2. Cf. John A. Demetracopoulos, *Ἀπὸ τῆν ἱστορίᾳ τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ θωμισμοῦ: Πλήθων καὶ Θωμᾶς Ἀκινάτης* (*From the History of Byzantine Thomism: Plethon and Thomas Aquinas*; with four Appendices) (Athens: Parousia 2004), 87–88, n. 221.

63 In 'ὥσπερ καὶ σοί,' Xenophanes's Scepticism is presented as being close to the famous Socratic ignorance, thus acquiring a tenor of modesty, which in turn seems potentially redolent of a religious spirit.

64 It seems that this echoes Heraclitus's B28 ("Δοκέοντα γὰρ ὁ δοκιμώτατος γινώσκει, φυλάσσει" / "For the most trustworthy man knows how to guard one from what seems to be the case"), which has been related (see, e.g., Barnes, *The Presocratics*, 145) to Xenophanes's B34. See also Plato, *Timaeus* 29B7–8: "... καθ' ὅσον οἶόν τε καὶ ἀνελέγκτοις προσήκει λόγοις εἶναι καὶ ἀνικητοῖς".

unless he can sail upon some stronger vessel, some divine revelation, and make his voyage more safely and securely.⁶⁵

In the *Phaedo*, unlike the *Meno* (see 81A), the *persona* of Socrates (85E1–2) neither repudiates directly what Xenophanes had said in B34 nor shows any clear mark of agreement with it. Socrates is partially in accord and partially in disaccord with Xenophanes. Socrates's point in the entire dialogue is that human knowledge of the soul's nature and of its fate after death is attainable through moral and intellectual exertion, and that he himself has obtained this knowledge. To this basic point, he adds a tiny reservation about the certainty of his conclusions, when, in an earlier moment of the dialogue (69D4–6), he implicitly paraphrases⁶⁶ ll. 1–2 of the B34 in a rather positive way:

Εἰ δ' ὁρθῶς προουθυμήθην [to become a philosopher] καὶ τι ἡνύσαμεν {12},
ἐκείσε [sc. in the life to come] ἐλθόντες τὸ σαφές [1] εἰσόμεθα [7], ἂν θεὸς
ἐθέλῃ, ὁλίγον ὕστερον, ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ.

But whether I have striven aright and have met with success, I believe
I shall know clearly, when I have arrived there, very soon, if it is god's will.⁶⁷

If pressed, I would say that the Platonic Socrates sees here the glass of human knowledge half-full: half, because of the restrictions of the human condition (we are souls prisoned in a body); and full, because of the human nature (we are still our souls, which are by nature bearers of the absolute truths).⁶⁸

65 Tr. Lamb, *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, I, *Euthyphro – Apology – Crito – Phaedo – Phaedrus* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1914; 161982), 297. Cf. David Gallop, tr., *Plato. Phaedo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 35. See also Plato, *Phaedo* 100A3–7: “... ὑποθέμενος ἐκάστοτε λόγον ὃν ἂν κρίνω ἐρρωμενέστατον εἶναι, ἃ μὲν ἂν μοι δοκῇ τοῦτω συμφωνεῖν, τίθημι ὡς ἀληθῆ ὄντα..., ἃ δ' ἂν μή, ὡς οὐκ ἀληθῆ βούλομαι” (“... I assume in each case some principle which I consider strongest, and whatever seems to me to agree with this, ... I regard as true, and whatever disagrees with it, as untrue”; tr. Lamb, op. cit., 343).

66 As has been noted by James H. Leshner, “Socrates’ Disavowal of Knowledge,” *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 25, 2 (1987): 275–88, at 286–87; id., *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 157; 167; 185.

67 Tr. Lamb, *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, II, 241; cf. Richard Stanley Bluck, *Plato's Phaedo. A Translation of Plato's "Phaedo"* (London: Bobbs-Merrill, 1955), 55. For this parallel, see Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 157; 167; 185, n. 12.

68 Still, I would not go as far as to say that Simmias is just a ‘straw man’ here, as suggested by Niketas Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium: Illumination and Utopia in Gemistos Plethon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 177; it is Simmias who insists that,

Leshner⁶⁹ has also pointed out Socrates's celebrated concluding words in Plato's *Apologia Socratis* (42A2–5) as parallel with B34:

Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἡδὴ ὥρα ἀπιέναι, ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀποθανουμένῳ, ὑμῖν δὲ βιωσομένοις.
Ὅπότεροι δὲ ἡμῶν ἔρχονται ἐπὶ ἄμεινον πράγμα, ἄδηνλον παντὶ πλὴν ἢ θεῷ.

But now the time has come to go away. I go to die, and you to live; but who of us goes to the better lot, *is known to none but God*.⁷⁰

It might have been on purpose that Socrates's very last word in his defence against the charge of 'impiety'⁷¹ was "God;" the contrast here is obviously between men and God, which is quite traditional and pious in tone. Still, the fact remains that this very last statement fully coincides with the epistemological view (and its correspondent way of life and death, of course) expressed in *Phaedo*. In both texts, Socrates holds firm, rationally grounded beliefs about human nature and death, and he feels that, in this life, man is not able to obtain *absolute* certainty about any belief. That is what Simmias says in *Phaedo* (see 263): one must, however difficult the effort, and for all the inherent uncertainty of the outcome, discover and follow the best possible opinion about the major issues of our life on earth. Comparing this position to B34, one would say that, whereas for Xenophanes the glass of our intellectual efforts is half-empty, for Socrates (and Plato) the glass is half-full or more.

Things become clearer in the famous discussion of dialectics in Book VII of the *Republic* (534B9–C8), where Socrates's speech seems to me a critical reformulation of Simmias's words in *Phaedo* (quoted above, 263):

Ὅς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ διορίσασθαι τῷ λόγῳ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων πάντων ἀφελῶν τὴν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ιδέαν, καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν μάχῃ⁷² διὰ πάντων ἐλέγχων διεξιῶν, μὴ κατὰ

however difficult the task of searching for truth, we must keep looking. As for his concluding words about the divine revelation, they can be construed as an emphasis on the need to persevere in seeking after truth; he implies that such perseverance is the only way forward, unless one believes he has access to some supra-human source of truth – which is not the case.

69 Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 185, n. 12.

70 Tr. Lamb, *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, I, 145.

71 Plato, *Apologia Socratis* 35D1–2; cf. Xenophon, *Memorabilia* I, 1, 11 and 20.

72 The beneficial results of the conflict of ideas are nicely described in Plato's (?) *Seventh Epistle* 344B4–7: "Μόγισ δὲ τριβόμενα πρὸς ἄλληλα αὐτῶν ἕκαστα, ὀνόματα καὶ λόγοι ὅψεις τε καὶ αἰσθήσεις, ἐν εὐμενέσιν ἐλέγχοις ἐλεγχόμενα καὶ ἄνευ φθόνων ἐρωτήσῃσιν καὶ ἀποκρίσεσιν χρωμένων, ἐξέλαμψε φρόνησις περὶ ἕκαστον καὶ νοῦς" (ed. Jennifer Moore-Blunt, *Platonis*

δόξαν ἀλλὰ κατ' οὐσίαν προθυμούμενος ἐλέγχειν, ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις ἀπτῶτι τῷ λόγῳ διαπορεύεται, οὔτε αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθὸν φήσεις εἰδέναι τὸν οὔτως ἔχοντα οὔτε ἄλλο ἀγαθὸν οὐδέν, ἀλλ' εἴ πη εἰδῶλου τινὸς ἐφάπτεται, δόξῃ, οὐκ ἐπιστήμῃ ἐφάπτεσθαι, καὶ τὸν νῦν βίον ὀνειροπολοῦντα καὶ ὑπνώττοντα, πρὶν ἐνθάδ' ἐξεγρέσθαι, εἰς Ἄϊδου πρότερον ἀφικόμενον τελέως ἐπικαταδαρθεῖν;

The man who is unable to define in his discourse and to distinguish and to abstract from all other things the aspect or idea of the good, and who cannot, as if in a battle, running the gauntlet of all tests,⁷³ and striving to examine everything by essential reality and not opinion, hold on his way through all this without any fall in the process of his argument – the man who lacks this power, you will say, does not really know the good itself or any particular good; but if he apprehends any adumbration of it, his contact with it is by opinion, not by knowledge; and dreaming and dozing through his present life, before he awakens here he will arrive at the house of Hades and fall asleep for ever?⁷⁴

This list of correspondences between the two Platonic passages shows that the later one, i.e. the one from the *Republic* (written ca. 375 BC),⁷⁵ is an elabo-

Epistulae [Leipzig: Teubner, 1985], 36, 15–18). The simile was elaborated by Boethius and, later on, by Demetrios Cydonēs: see John A. Demetracopoulos, “Thomas Aquinas’ Impact on Late Byzantine Theology and Philosophy: the Issues of Method or *Modus Sciendi* and *Dignitas Homini*,” in *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*, ed. Andreas Speer and Philipp Steinkrüger (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 333–410, at 367, n. 193.

73 On the subject of these tests (not some other persons, but the contrary arguments per se, which are structured by the dialectician himself) see James Adam, *The Republic of Plato. Second Edition*, II, *Bks VI–X* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962; repr. 1980), 142 (ad 534C15).

74 Tr. Paul Shorey, *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, VI, *The Republic, Books VI–X* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1935; 1980), 207–209, amended with regard to ἀπτῶς, which here means ‘without suffering any fall,’ i.e., without falling down from any of the hits by one’s opponents. This simile derives from fighting or wrestling (‘ὥσπερ ἐν μάχῃ’). Of course, it implies that the dialectician “holds on this way [...] without tripping” (tr. Shorey, 207), since ‘error’ is one of the derivative meanings of πτῶσις. Still, in light of Plato’s repeated insistence on the bravery one must show during one’s dialectical course towards truth (see *infra*, n. 77), the simile must be rendered accurately.

75 See Nikos M. Skouteropoulos, *Πλάτων. Πολιτεία. Εἰσαγωγικὸ σημεῖωμα – μετάφραση – ἐρμηνευτικὰ σχόλια* (Athens: Polis, 2002), 16–17.

ration of the earlier, namely, the one from the *Phaedo* (written shortly after 388/7 BC):⁷⁶

- 1) *Rep.*: ὥσπερ ἐν μάχῃ; *Ph.* (*e contrario*): μὴ [...] πάνυ μαλθακοῦ εἶναι ἀνδρός;⁷⁷
- 2) *Rep.*: διὰ πάντων ἐλέγχων, ἐλέγχειν, and ἀπτῶτι τῷ λόγῳ; *Ph.*: παντὶ τρόπῳ ἐλέγχειν and πανταχῇ σκοπῶν, δυσεξελεγκτότατον;
- 3) *Rep.*: διαπορεύηται; *Ph.*: διαπορευθῆναι, ἀφικόμενον;
- 4) *Rep.*: εἰδέναι and ἐπιστήμη; *Ph.*: τὸ σαφές εἰδέναι;
- 5) *Rep.*: τὸν νῦν βίον; *Ph.*: ἐν τῷ νῦν βίῳ and τὸν βίον.

In the *Republic* passage, the traces of Xenophanes's B34 have been assimilated into a typically Platonic language. Εἰδέναι, of course, is still here; nonetheless, instead of Xenophanes's σαφές, we read ἐπιστήμη, whereas Xenophanes's δόκος, which does not occur in the *Phaedo*, is transformed into Plato's δόξα and εἰδῶλον.

So, it seems that in the above lines from the *Republic* we have Plato's reply to B34. Socrates, who in the *Phaedo* had silently bypassed Simmias's assimilation of B34, now emphatically stresses that a man must overcome not only his deplorable state of ignorance but also the state of holding opinions founded on shaky grounds. What makes an idea worthy of being called true is not its being accidentally true, but its passing all the rational tests that can be posed by humans' discussion. This epistemological idea is exactly what vv. 3–4 of B34 say. Still, Plato rejects Xenophanes's pessimistic conclusion that, frankly speaking,

76 See Léon Robin, "Notice" in *Platon. Œuvres complètes*, IV, 1, *Phédon*, ed. and tr. Paul Vicaire (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1983; ²1995), viii.

77 See also Plato's *Meno* 81D3–E1: "... ἐάν τις ἀνδρείος ᾗ καὶ μὴ ἀποκάμνη ζητῶν. [...] Οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ δεῖ πείθεσθαι τούτῳ τῷ ἐριστικῷ λόγῳ· οὗτος μὲν γὰρ ἂν ἡμᾶς ἀργοὺς ποιήσειεν καὶ ἔστιν τοῖς μαλακοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡδὺς ἀκούσαι, ὅδε δὲ [sc. that knowledge is the happy outcome of inward process of reminiscence] ἐργατικούς τε καὶ ζητητικούς ποιεῖ" / "... if we have courage and faint not in the research. [...] So we must not hearken to that captious argument: it would make us idle, and is pleasing only to the indolent ear, whereas the other makes us energetic and inquiring" (tr. Lamb, *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, II, 303). The point is that Xenophanean pessimism and Sophistic relativism or subjectivism are wrong both in moral and cognitive respect. Arguing and counter-arguing about a concrete doctrine might result in despair about the possibility of reaching knowledge; the 'dialectician' is he who can stand the pressure of this process, cope with the objections raised in the discussion, and successfully reach his end. Cf. Plato, *Republic* 458A1–B1; *Sophist* 241C4; *Philebus* 21D6; *Euthyphro* 15C11–12; *Cratylus* 411A6–8; Pseudo-Plato, *Alcibiades* 124D6–9. Cf. Richard Patterson, "Plato on Philosophic Character," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 25, 3 (1987): 325–50; id., "Philosophos Agonistes: Imagery and Moral Psychology in Plato's *Republic*," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 34, 3 (1997): 327–54, at 339 and 345–48.

against such high standards, what one can achieve is not knowledge but only opinion. To Plato, certain knowledge, at least for some men, is attainable. What sort of knowledge does Plato have in mind? Unlike Xenophanes, Plato does not focus on the visible or invisible universe; his knowledge regards the good per se as well as its various ramifications.

Now, apart from the *Apologia Socratis* 19C2–4, where a direct negative reference to Aristophanes's *Clouds* occurs, the *Phaedo*, which was written about four decades after the *Clouds*, seems to be, at least as far as specific parts of it are concerned (particularly the famous autobiographical section: 96A–100A), a refutation of Aristophanes's caricature of Socrates.⁷⁸ Correspondences of this sort exist between the *Clouds* and some other Platonic writings, too.⁷⁹ To the list of Plato's implicit replies to Aristophanes, one might add Plato's clear attribution of intellectual modesty to Socrates, redolent of Xenophanes's B34.

That the divine things (περί μεγάλων; περί θεῶν; τὰ οὐράνια καὶ θεῖα) are, because of their inaccessibility, much harder to know (οὐδὲν εἰδότες ἀκριβὲς περί τῶν τοιούτων) than the human ones (τὰ θνητὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα) was explicitly stated by the elderly Plato (ca. 360 BC) in *Critias* (106C–E).⁸⁰ This modest

78 See Justin Broackes, "Αὐτὸς καὶ αὐτόν in the *Clouds*: Was Socrates Himself a Defender of the Separable Soul and the Separate Forms?" *Classical Quarterly* 59, 1 (2009): 46–59, at 55–58; Giovanni Cerri, "Le *Nuvole* di Aristofane e la realtà storica di Socrate," in *La commedia greca e la storia. Atti del Seminario di studio, Urbino, 18–20 maggio 2010*, ed. Franca Perusino and Maria Colantonio (Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2012), 151–94, at 158–60.

79 See, e.g., Guthrie, *A History*, 111, 373–75; Coulon, *Aristophane*, 1, 151–52; 170; 173; Peter Brown, "Socrates in Comedy," in *Socrates. 2400 Years Since His Death. Athens-Delphi 13–21 July 2001. International Symposium Proceedings*, ed. Vassilis Karasmanis (Athens: European Cultural Centre of Delphi, 2004), 525–36, at 527 and 530; Carey, "Old Comedy," 435, n. 24. Some scholars take this as indicating that Plato did that deliberately, whereas others account for the elements common in Plato and Aristophanes in terms of Aristophanes's knowledge of Socrates's way of life, interests, method, and doctrine. Dover (*Aristophanes*, 269) has argued against taking the *Clouds* and Socrates's intellectual autobiography in *Phaedo* 96A–B this way ("The more closely *Phaedo* is pressed to mean that Socrates at one time pursued the scientific interests caricatured in *Nubes*, the greater the falsehood in Plato's *Apology* 19D, where Socrates asks all those in the jury 'who have ever at any time up to now listened to my conversation' to tell their fellow jurors 'whether anyone among you has ever heard me talk at all on such subjects'"). Yet, what Socrates staunchly denies in the *Apology* is not that he had *studied* natural philosophy but that he had *taught* natural philosophy; and this perfectly fits his point in *Phaedo*; whereas he had passionately started his adventure towards truth with natural philosophy, in the course of time he realised that what is called 'natural explanation' of a being or phenomenon is just a description of it.

80 On the date of *Timaeus* and *Critias* see, e.g., Basileios Kalphas, *Πλάτων. Τίμαιος. Εἰσαγωγή – μετάφραση – σχόλια* (Athens: Polis, 1995), 28–32.

truism is used by the *persona* of Critias as a preliminary caveat in order not to have his speech severely judged by his interlocutors. Even so, it would not be absurd to construe the truism as a later version of Plato's famous stress in *Timaeus* (28C3–5) on how hard it is to grasp and share with others the truth about the divine. In fact, as has recently been suggested,⁸¹ a closer examination of the words of the *persona* of Timaeus in the proem (προοίμιον; 29D4) of his main speech points in this direction. This proem (27C1–29D2) ends up with these words (29C4–D2):

Ἐάν . . . πολλὰ {9;10} πολλῶν περί {10}, θεῶν [8] καὶ τῆς τοῦ παντός [10] γενέσεως, μὴ δυνατοὶ γινώμεθα πάντῃ πάντως αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς ὁμολογουμένους λόγους [9] καὶ ἀπηκριβωμένους {1} ἀποδοῦναι, μὴ θαυμάσης· ἀλλ' ἐάν ἄρα μηδενὸς ἦττον παρεχώμεθα εἰκότας {14}, ἀγαπᾶν χρή, μεμνημένους ὡς ὁ λέγων [9] ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς τε οἱ χριταὶ φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνην {4} ἔχομεν, ὥστε περὶ τούτων τὸν εἰκότα {14} μῦθον {9} ἀποδεχομένους πρέπει τοῦτου μηδὲν ἔτι πέρα ζητεῖν.

If in our treatment of a great host of matters regarding the gods and the generation of the universe we prove unable to give accounts that are always in all respects self-consistent and perfectly exact, be not you surprised; rather we should be content if we can furnish accounts that are inferior to none in likelihood, remembering that both I who speak and you who judge are but human creatures, so that it becomes us to accept the likely account of these matters and forbear to search beyond it.⁸²

81 Mourelatos, "The Epistemological," 239; Jenny Bryan, *Likeliness and Likelihood in the Presocratics and Plato* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 183–86. Mourelatos speaks cautiously about 'comparable texts,' and Bryan warns that "it would be difficult to argue with any confidence that Plato is deliberately alluding to his predecessor," whereas I, both in view of Plato's lines in *Timaeus* and *Critias* and the Platonic allusions to B34 examined here, would be prepared to see these lines as a conscious rephrasing of Xenophanes's lines so as a reply to them be given that says that, even if man is not able to obtain an absolutely certain vision of truth in this life, he is nevertheless able – in fact, it is his duty – to formulate the best possible concept of it. Plato's shift amounts to seeing Xenophanes's half-empty glass as more than half-full. Besides, both Mourelatos and Bryan plausibly draw attention themselves to *Timaeus* 29C4–5 ("θεῶν καὶ τῆς παντός γενέσεως") as a possible allusion to B34, vv. 1–2 ("ἀμφὶ θεῶν τε καὶ ἄσασα λέγω περὶ πάντων"). David L. Guetter, "Making Sense of 'The Appropriate' in Plato's *Timaeus*" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1997), 1, 3–4, 8 and 13 had already paralleled Plato's passage from *Timaeus* to Xenophanes's B34 and 35, though he did not focus on verbal similarities so as to establish a possible direct connection.

82 Tr. Robert Gregg Bury, *Plato in Twelve volumes*, IX, *Timaeus – Critias – Cleitophon – Menexenus – Epistles* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1924), 53. See also Plato,

According to Proclus's comment, these lines differentiate Plato from 'the other philosophers' (e.g., the Presocratics, such as Heraclitus and Empedocles, and the Stoics), who, lacking Socrates's and Plato's modesty, arrogantly claim that 'they know everything.'⁸³ Yet, as I hope becomes apparent from the comparison of these lines with Xenophanes's B34, Plato reproduces here Xenophanes's statement that clear and certain knowledge of the great cosmological issues is inaccessible to humans, whereas he at the same time repeats what he says in many of his writings (see *supra*, 267, n. 77), namely, that it is highly desirable for us humans to investigate the philosophical issues as far as possible, and produce what can count as the most plausible description and interpretation of the universe: namely, as that description and interpretation which is the hardest of all to refute (λόγους [...] μηδενὸς ἥττον παρεχώμεθα εἰκότας),⁸⁴ because it is supported by necessary arguments (*Timaeus* 53D5–6: τὸν μετ' ἀνάγκης εἰκότα λόγον).⁸⁵ As G.E.R. Lloyd paraphrases 29C4–D2, "the cosmology of the *Timaeus* is not an exact and entirely self-consistent account, because the subject-matter, Plato believes, does not allow this. But it is *the best account possible*, nevertheless."⁸⁶

In sum, Plato seems to agree with Xenophanes that the discovery of truth about the major issues is a hard and slippery process. But he also holds that the difficulties should not discourage us⁸⁷ so as to make us abstain from using our

Timaeus 48D1–3. All the words noted here as parallel have already been noted as such by Mourelatos (see previous note).

83 Proclus, *In Platonis "Timaeum" commentaria*, II, in Ernst Diehl, ed., *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, I (Leipzig: Teubner, 1903; repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965), 351, 5–14.

84 I take 'μηδενός' as referring to 'λόγοι'; on the scholarly disagreement that arises from the grammatically and syntactically possible (yet, to me, stylistically awkward) alternative to construe it as referring to persons, see Mourelatos, "The Epistemological," 227–28, who opts (elaborating on Burnyeat's reading of the passage) for the personal construe.

85 Plato goes on by saying: "Τὰς δ' ἔτι τούτων ἀρχὰς ἀνωθεν θεὸς οἶδεν καὶ ἀνδρῶν ὃς ἂν ἐκείνῳ φίλος ᾖ" (53D6–7), which is how he concludes the *Phaedo* passage which latently assimilates B34 (see *supra*, 263). This suggests that the passage from *Timaeus* is a re-elaboration of the passage from *Phaedo*.

86 Geoffrey Ernest Richard Lloyd, "Plato as a Natural Scientist," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 88 (1968): 78–92, at 81.

87 See also Plato, *Cratylus* 425B8–C3: "Εάσομεν οὖν, ἢ βούλει οὕτως ὅπως ἂν δυνώμεθα, καὶ ἂν σμικρόν τι αὐτῶν οἴοι τ' ὦμεν κατιδεῖν {5}, ἐπιχειρώμεν, προειπόντες, ὥσπερ ὀλίγον πρότερον τοῖς θεοῖς [8], ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδότες [2; 7] τῆς ἀληθείας {1} τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων {4; 15} δόγματα {14} περὶ αὐτῶν {8} εἰκάζομεν {14} . . ." / "Shall we give up then? Or shall we do the best we can and try to see if you are able to understand even a little about them, and, just as we said to the gods a while ago that we knew nothing about the truth but were guessing at human

minds to reach the truth hidden in us. And he feels that at least some people can supersede the level of mere opinion to reach certain knowledge, either by thinking on their own or by paying due attention to those who have reached it themselves.

7 *Isocrates*

In *Nicocles* (§26), which probably dates from 372/365 BC,⁸⁸ Isocrates (436–338 BC) seems to use Xenophanes's fragment in order to declare, incidentally and undogmatically, man's inability to know divine things:⁸⁹

Εἰ δὲ τὸ μὲν σαφές [i.e. the clear perception of ἀλήθεια, word used in the preceding period] [1] μηδεὶς οἶδεν [2/4], αὐτοὶ δ' εἰκάζοντες [cf. Xenophanes's "δόκος"] οὕτω περὶ αὐτῶν [sc. on the divine matters: τοὺς θεούς] {10} ὑπειλήφαμεν [cf. Xenophanes's "δόκος"] . . .

But if no one knows the clear truth about this matter, and it is we who by own conjecture have simply supposed it to be so . . .⁹⁰

The context of this reproduction of B34 is not, of course, philosophical and for that reason we cannot use it to ascribe to Isocrates the epistemological scepticism of Xenophanes. Isocrates's topic, the superiority of monarchy as a form of government,⁹¹ is wholly irrelevant to Xenophanes's epistemology; at this point in his speech, after arguing for monarchy by drawing on the myth about Zeus's only ruling over the Olympian gods, Isocrates proceeds to address another target group, namely, those reluctant to take such myths naïvely, at their face value. Isocrates does not state or even imply that he himself shares this scepti-

opinion about them . . ." (tr. Henry North Fowler, *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, IV, *Cratylus – Parmenides – Greater Hippias – Lesser Hippias* [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1926; 61977], 141). See also *Cratylus* 400D: "... περὶ θεῶν οὐδὲν ἴσμεν ..." (cf. Richard Bodéüs, *Aristotle and the Theology of the Living Immortals*, tr. Jan Garrett [Albany: SUNY Press, 2000], 101). The date of *Cratylus* (ca. 387/85 BC?) is debated; see the brief account by Giorgos Kentrotis, *Πλάτων. Κρατύλος ἢ περὶ ὁρθότητος ὀνομάτων, λογικός. Εἰσαγωγή, μετάφραση, σχόλια* (Athens: Polis, 2001), 40–41.

88 See David C. Mirhady and Yun Lee Too, *Isocrates*, I (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000), 10.

89 See Demetracopoulos, *Πλήθων*, 94, n. 246.

90 Georges Mathieu and Émile Brémond, *Isocrate. Discours*, II (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1938; 61987), 126–27; tr. George Norlin, *Isocrates*, I (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1928; 61991), 93, slightly modified.

91 Isocrates, *Nicocles* 11–27, in Mathieu and Brémond, *Isocrate*, II, 100–27.

cal stance towards the traditional view of gods. Besides, overtly revealing his beliefs on this matter would have alienated those of his addressees who had a different view on religious matters; it would be rhetorically inept. So, in the lines just quoted, it seems that he merely produced an argument suited to a particular subset of his audience to make a point: after addressing those who shared the traditional religious beliefs, he addressed a group of Athenians who, probably nurtured in a Sophistic atmosphere, did not share them.

Let me press the point a bit further. One of the peculiar features of Isocrates's educational ideal was his dismissal of metaphysics and downgrading of the sciences and natural studies to the level of an activity propaedeutic to genuine philosophy, which he understood as rhetoric and wise deliberation on how to act.⁹² It would be absurd, he says, to observe oneself wasting away in an endless effort to find out, for example, the number of the principles of beings.⁹³ Isocrates regarded even practical wisdom as hard to attain, because of 'human nature' itself.⁹⁴ So, it would not be implausible to think that he was inclined to share the view that man is unable to understand the nature of the divine.

92 Isocrates, *Antidosis* 266–270, in Mathieu and Brémond, *Isocrate. Discours*, III (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1944; ²1991), 168–69; *Panathenaicus* 26–32, in Mathieu and Brémond, *Isocrate*, IV (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1962; ²1972), 94–95. Cf. *inter alia*, Ilsetraut Hadot, *Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique* (Paris: Vrin, 1984), 16–17.

93 Isocrates, *Antidosis* 268 (Mathieu and Brémond, *Isocrate*, III, 168). The wording of this passage appears to reflect Plato's *Republic* VII, 517B7–C7, but does not. For Plato, the philosophers must put an end to their verse with erudition not because erudition fails to reveal truth (quite the contrary) but because they are hopefully to replace bad rulers and govern the state in the light of their certain knowledge of truth.

94 See, e.g., Isocrates, *Antidosis* 271 (Mathieu and Brémond, *Isocrate*, III, 169): “Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἔνεστιν ἐν τῇ φύσει τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιστήμην λαβεῖν, ἣν ἔχοντες ἂν εἰδείμεν ὅ τι πρακτέον ἢ λεκτέον ἐστίν, ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν σοφοὺς μὲν νομίζω τοὺς ταῖς δόξαις ἐπιτυγχάνειν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τοῦ βελτίστου δυναμένους, φιλοσόφους δὲ τοὺς ἐν τούτοις διατρίβοντας, ἐξ ὧν τάχιστα λήψονται τὴν τοιαύτην φρόνησιν” / “For since it is not in the nature of man to attain a science by the possession of which we can know positively what we should do or we should say, in the next resort I hold that man to be wise who is able *by his powers of conjecture* to arrive generally at the best course, and I hold that man to be a philosopher who occupies himself with the studies from which he will most quickly gain that kind of insight” (tr. George Norlin, *Isocrates*, II [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1929; ⁶1992], 335). Cf. Juan Luis López Cruces and Pedro Pablo Fuentes González, “Isocrate d'Athènes,” in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, ed. Richard Goulet (Paris: CNRS, 2000; ²2005), III: 891–938, at 906–907. See also Isocrates's *In Sophistas* 2–4 (Mathieu and Brémond, *Isocrate*, I [Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1929; ⁴1972], 144), which stresses the limits of human knowledge, in contrast to divine knowledge of the future. “Les idées d'Isocrate sur ce point sont exactement contraires à celles de Platon” (Mathieu and Brémond, 145, n. 2).

Besides, from man's innate inability to attain that goal which other philosophers over-optimistically and arrogantly call 'certain knowledge' (ἐπιστήμη), he infers that 'wisdom' or 'prudence' consists in trying to find the best possible way of acting by means of ideas regarded as falling under a lower yet accessible class, i.e. 'opinions' (δόξαι).⁹⁵ This position might seem to reflect the second clause of the last verse of Xenophanes's B34 ('δόκος'). Isocrates, in his imitation of the fragment, preserves even Xenophanes's μὲν...δέ (Xenophanes: τὸ μὲν οὖν σαφές οὐ τις ἀνὴρ ἶδεν [...], δόκος δ'...; Isocrates: τὸ μὲν σαφές μηδεὶς οἶδεν, αὐτοὶ δ' εἰκάζοντες...). If my observation is correct, then we can say that Isocrates's statements stand as an application of Xenophanes's epistemological scepticism about natural and divine matters to human affairs.⁹⁶

8 Metrodorus of Chios

Epiphanius, shortly after his quotation of Xenophanes's B34 (see *supra*, 250), reports Metrodorus of Chios's (mid-4th century BC)⁹⁷ doctrine of knowledge. His lines (Metrodorus, fr. A23)⁹⁸ look like an assimilation of B34:

- 95 Isocrates, *ibid.*; *In Sophistas* 8 (Mathieu and Brémond, *Isocrate*, I, 146) (cf. Werner Jaeger, *Paideia. Die Formung des griechischen Menschen*, 111 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1947], 116–19). See also how Isocrates describes the central feature of his own mental idiosyncrasy: "[...] τὴν δὲ φύσιν εἰδὼς [...] δοξάζει μὲν περὶ ἐκάστου τὴν ἀλήθειαν μᾶλλον δυναμένην τῶν εἰδέναι φασκόντων" (Isocrates, *Panathenaicus* 9, in Mathieu and Brémond, *Isocrate*, 111, 89) / "As for my nature, however, I realized that I was better able to form a *correct judgment* of the truth of any matter than are those who claim to *have exact knowledge*" (tr. Norlin, *Isocrates*, 11, 379). For an investigation of the full range of the concept of δόξα in Isocrates and its intellectual and cultural antecedents and context, see Takis Poulakos, "Isocrates' Use of Doxa," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 34, 1 (2001): 61–78; *id.*, "Isocrates' Civic Education and the Question of Doxa," in *Isocrates and Civic Education*, ed. Takis Poulakos and David Depew (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 44–65.
- 96 On some other possible Xenophanean echoes in Isocrates (*Panegyricus* 1–5 and 32, in Mathieu and Brémond, *Isocrate*, 11, 15–16; 22; cf. 14, n. 1), see Paul Shorey, "Note on Xenophanes Fr. 18 (Diels) and Isocrates' *Panegyricus* 32," *Classical Philology* 6 (1911): 88–89; Konrat Ziegler, "Xenophanes von Kolophon, ein Revolutionar des Geistes," *Gymnasium* 72 (1965): 289–302, at 301, n. 8. On the Xenophanean background to Isocrates's *Busiris* 38, see Daniel Babut, "Xénophane critique des poètes," *L'Antiquité classique* 43 (1974): 83–117 (= *id.*, *Parerga*, 11–45), at 90–91; 110, n. 113. On some other similarities of Isocrates's thought with that of Xenophanes, see Karl Münscher, "Isokrates," *Paulys Realenzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, xviii, 2 (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1916; repr. 1997), 2146–227, at 2151.
- 97 Richard Goulet, "Métrodoire de Chios," in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, ed. Goulet, iv (Paris: CNRS, 2005), 506–508.
- 98 Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, 11, 233, 15–17.

... "Εφη μηδέν {2/3/6} μηδέν {7-10} ἐπίστασθαι {5; 7}, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα, ἃ δοκοῦμεν γινώσκειν {5; 7}, ἀκριβῶς {1} οὐκ ἐπιστάμεθα {5; 7} ... Δοκῆσει [14] γὰρ ἐστὶ τὰ πάντα {15}.

... He said that no one knows anything, but those things, which we seem to know, we do not precisely know [...] For all things lie in belief.⁹⁹

Diels and Kranz cautiously included these lines in the *testimonia*, not the fragments of Metrodorus.¹⁰⁰ Still, Epiphanius's introductory ἔφη makes it possible to press things further. Correspondences N° 1, 14, and 15 have been recently pointed out by Shaul Tor.¹⁰¹ The remaining points of correspondence (most of which are, in any case, obvious) are noted above.

Diels and Kranz classify as 'fragment' (B1) some lines from another doxographical passage from the lost writing by Aristocles, *On Philosophy*, which is preserved in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Praeparatio evangelica*. These lines offer a version which explicitly connects Metrodorus with Scepticism but not directly with Xenophanes:

"Ἐπεται τούτοις συνεξετάσαι καὶ τοὺς [...] πάντα χρῆναι πιστεύειν ταῖς τοῦ σώματος αἰσθήσεσιν ὀρισμένους, ὧν εἶναι Μητρόδωρον τὸν Χίον καὶ Πρωταγόραν τὸν Ἀβδηρίτην. Τὸν μὲν οὖν Μητρόδωρον [...]. Γράφων γέ τοι *Περὶ φύσεως* εἰσβολὴ ἐχρήσατο τοιαύτη· "Οὐδεὶς ἡμῶν οὐδὲν οἶδεν, οὐδ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο, πότερον οἶδαμεν ἢ οὐκ οἶδαμεν" [...]. "Ἦτις εἰσβολὴ κακὰς ἔδωκεν ἀφορμὰς τῷ μετὰ ταῦτα γενομένῳ Πύρρωνι. Προβάς δέ φησιν ὅτι "πάντα ἐστίν, ὃ ἂν τις νοήσαι".¹⁰²

It is proper to examine [along with the Aristippeans] those [...] who declared that we must trust all the sense data provided by the body, including Metrodorus of Chios and Protagoras of Abdera. [...] When writing his *On Nature*, he [sc. Metrodorus] began by saying: "None of us knows anything, not even whether we know or do not know this very

99 Epiphanius of Salamis, *Adversus haereses* III, 2, 9 in Holl, ed., *Epiphanius. 3. Band*, 590, 35-37; tr. Shaul Tor, "Sextus Empiricus on Xenophanes' Scepticism," *International Journal for the Study of Scepticism* 3 (2013): 1-23, at 16.

100 Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, II, 234, 1-13.

101 Tor, "Sextus," 16-17.

102 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praeparatio evangelica* XIV, 19, 8, in *Eusèbe de Césarée. La Préparation évangélique. Livres XIV-XV*, ed., tr., annot. Édouard des Places (SC 338; Paris: Cerf, 1987), 168 (= Metrodorus's fr. B1 in Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, II, 234, 1-12).

thing (sc. that we do not know anything) [...]. These introductory words stood as an unfortunate starting point of inspiration for Pyrrho, who lived later on. Besides, in the course of his writing Metrodorus claims that “all things are whatever one happens to think they are.”

It seems that, in the first fragment, Metrodorus paraphrases the celebrated Socratic dictum ἐν μόνον οἶδα, ὅτι οὐδὲν οἶδα,¹⁰³ which he radicalizes by drawing out its implicit conclusion that this particular ἐν cannot be exempted from οὐδέν. What about what Metrodorus says “in the course of his writing,” i.e. that πάντα ἐστίν, ὃ ἄν τις νοήσαι? In Aristocles’s passage as quoted by Eusebius, Metrodorus’s Scepticism is presented as going hand in hand with Protagoras’s agnosticism; Metrodorus’s statement that πάντα ἐστίν, ὃ ἄν τις νοήσαι sounds like a version of Protagoras’s πᾶσα φαντασία ἐστὶν ἀληθής (fr. A15)¹⁰⁴ and the *homo mensura* maxim (fr. A13; A14; B1).¹⁰⁵ Still, even here, maybe Xenophanes is not absent. Let us go back to Epiphanius’s information that, to Metrodorus, δοκήσει [...] ἐστὶ τὰ πάντα. If this is a paraphrase of Xenophanes’s δόκος δ’ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται, Metrodorus takes πᾶσι as neutral and construes it as referring to the object of knowledge, which means that he regards it as equivalent to Protagoras’s χρήματα ἅπαντα (fr. B1). This in turn means that Metrodorus would possibly agree with the above argued view (254–255) that Protagoras’s subjectivism and Xenophanes’s Scepticism are close to each other and explains why Aristocles brings, in the above fragment of his, Protagoras and Metrodorus so close together.

9 Aristotle

9.1 *Poetics*, Ch. 25

It has sometimes been argued¹⁰⁶ that B34 is the Xenophanean passage alluded to in Aristotle’s (384–322 BC) *Poetics* 25, 1460b35–1461a1:

103 *Apud* Philo of Alexandria, *De plantatione* 80: “...μόνον εἰδέναι ὅτι οὐδὲν οἶδεν” (in Paul Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, II [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1896], 149, 21); cf. Plato, *Apologia Socratis* 21D5–7; id., *Symposium* 216D3–4.

104 Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, II, 258, 38.

105 This interpretation of Metrodorus’s statement has been challenged so as to make it compatible with his Atomistic identity: see Matteo Andolfo, *Atomisti antichi. Testimonianze e frammenti secondo la raccolta di H. Diels e W. Kranz* (Milan: Bompiani, 1999), 523–24, n. 167. Its translation as “esiste tutto ciò che si conosce” (Andolfo, op. cit., 423) is syntactically impossible to me.

106 See, e.g., Ioannis Sykoutris, *Ἀριστοτέλους Περὶ ποιητικῆς. Μετάφρασις ὑπὸ Σ. Μενάρδου. Εἰσαγωγή, κείμενον, καὶ ἐρμηνεία ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου Συκουτρῆ* (Athens: Hestia 1937), 236, n. 4; Augusto Rostagni, *Aristotele. Poetica. Introduzione, testo e commento. Seconda edizione*

...Ἐὰν ἐπιτιμᾶται ὅτι οὐκ ἀληθῆ, ἀλλ' ἴσως ὥς δεῖ... Εἰ δὲ μηδετέρως, ὅτι οὕτω φασίν, οἷον τὰ “περὶ θεῶν”. Ἴσως γὰρ οὔτε βέλτιον οὕτω λέγειν οὐτ' ἀληθῆ, ἀλλ' εἰ ἔτυχεν ὥσπερ Ξενοφάνει· ἀλλ' οὖν φασι”.¹⁰⁷

If the criticism is that something is false, well perhaps it is as it ought to be. [...] If neither solution fits, there remains the principle that people say such things, for example, as far as gods are concerned; perhaps it is neither ideal nor true to say such things, but maybe it is as Xenophanes thought; no matter, people do say them.¹⁰⁸

This claim has been challenged mainly on the grounds that “Xenophanes was celebrated not so much for his scepticism as for his denunciation of the traditional stories about the gods told by Homer and Hesiod as being morally inadequate”.¹⁰⁹ It seems to me that Aristotle's ὥς δεῖ and βέλτιον are connected

riveduta (Turin: Chiantore 1945), 159, *ad* 1460b36. Sykoutris often reproduces silently some German philosophers' and scholars' interpretive patterns and ideas (see Theocharoula M. Niftanidou, “Ioannis Sykoutris en tant que théoricien de la littérature,” *Revue des études neo-helléniques* 4 (2008): 45–63, at 59–63; Constanze Güthenke, “Editing the Nation. Classical Scholarship in Greece, ca. 1930,” in *Classics and National Culture*, ed. Susan Stephens and Phiroze Vasunia [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010], 121–40, at 138–40); so, we cannot be sure about the exact origins of his parallelism of Aristotle's lines from the *Poetics* with Xenophanes's B34. On the 19th-century history of this parallelism see Karsten, *Xenophanis*, 52 and 187–88, note 6, who suspends judgment on whether this pairing is true or not, and Zeller, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, I, 558–59, n. 1, who severely criticizes some audacious conjectural emendations of Aristotle's lines which attempted at presenting them as alluding to B34 (e.g., the emendation of “ἀλλ' οὖν φασι” in 1461a1 to “ἀλλ' οὐ σαφῆ”). The earliest interpretation of Aristotle's lines as an allusion to Xenophanes's B34 was made by Petrus Victorius, *Commentarii in primum librum Aristotelis de arte poetarum* (Florentiae, 1560), 276 (cf. Gottfried Hermann, *Aristotelis de arte poetica liber cum commentariis* [Lipsiae, 1802], 181; Augustus Guillelmus Graefenhan, *Aristotelis de arte poetica* [Lipsiae, 1821], 202).

- 107 Leonardo Tarán, ed., *Aristotle. Poetics. Editio Maior of the Greek Text with Historical Introductions and Philological Commentaries by L. Tarán (Greek and Latin, edition of the Greek Text) and Dimitri Gutas (Arabic and Syriac)* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 213.
- 108 Tr. Stephen Halliwell, in *Aristotle. Poetics. Edited and Translated by Stephen Halliwell. Longinus. On the Sublime. Translated by W. Hamilton Fyfe; revised by Donald Russell. Demetrius. On Style. Edited and Translated by Doreen C. Innes, Based on W. Rhys Roberts* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1995; 21999), 129, slightly changed.
- 109 *Aristotle's Poetics. A Translation and Commentary for Students of Literature. Translation by Leon Golden. Commentary by O.B. Hardison* (Gainesville FL: Florida State University Press, 1963), 276; cf. Augustus Guillelmus Graefenhan, *Aristotelis De arte poetica liber* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1821), 205. See also Ingram Bywater, *Ἀριστοτέλους Περὶ ποιητικῆς. Aristotle.*

with Xenophanes's critique of the traditional images of gods, whereas ἀληθῆ is connected with Xenophanes's critique of the misguided, traditional certainty about the human knowledge of gods.¹¹⁰ That B34 may be implicit here is rendered more probable than usually estimated by its more probable presence in two other Aristotelian writings (see next paragraphs). Be that as it may, Aristotle's possible allusion to B34 in the *Poetics* (probably written before 360 BC)¹¹¹ is not accompanied by any interpretation.

9.2 *Posterior Analytics* I

Further, it has been hastily suggested by Antonios G. Markos¹¹² that Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* I, 9, 76a26: Χαλεπόν δ' ἐστὶ τὸ γινῶναι εἰ οἶδεν ἢ μή... ("It is hard to be sure whether one knows or not...")¹¹³ echoes Xenophanes's B34. At first sight, Aristotle does not intend here to give a reply to Xenophanes's doctrine of the knowability of things; to Aristotle, the hardness he is speaking about can be superseded by means of his own doctrine of the valid derivation of conclusions from the proper principles; Aristotle's remark forms part of his

On the *Art of Poetry*. A Revised Text With Critical Introduction, Translation and Commentary (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 331–32; Donald W. Lucas, *Aristotle. Poetics. Introduction, Commentary and Appendixes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 239, ad 1461a1; Arbogast Schmitt, *Aristoteles. Poetik. Übersetzt und erläutert* (Berlin: Oldenburg 2008), 714.

110 Cf. *Aristotle's Treatise on Poetry, Translated with Notes on the Translation and the Original; and Two Dissertations on Poetical and Musical Imitation by Th. Twining. The Second Edition, in two Volumes, by D. Twining*, II (London: Hansard and Son, 1812), 382–83, where a plausible combination of the two possibilities is suggested; see also Halliwell, *Aristotle. Poetics*, 129, note e, where Aristotle's words are seen as having equal distance from each of the two possibilities. – On some echoes of Xenophanes in Aristotle see Laura Burelli-Bergese, "Allusioni a Senofane nel I libro della *Politica* di Aristotele (1252b25, 1254b30)," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filosofia. Filosofia* s. III, 3,1 (1973): 49–52.

111 See Ingemar Düring, *Aristoteles. Darstellung und Interpretation seines Denkens* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1966).

112 Antonios G. Markos, "Η ιδέα τῆς προόδου στὸν Ξενοφάνη" (The Concept of Progress in Xenophanes; PhD diss., University of Athens, 1983), 186; see also id., "Η 'φύσις' τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὡς αἰτία τῆς ἀκαταληψίας" τῶν πραγμάτων κατὰ τὸν Ξενοφάνη καὶ τὸν Πύρρωνα," *Skepsis. A Journal for Philosophy and Interdisciplinary Research* 1 (1990): 27–49, at 33; id., "So hat er selbst trotzdem kein Wissen davon. Von Xenophanes bis Pyrrhon von Elis," *Platon* 46 (1994): 98–107, at 103.

113 Tr. William David Ross, *Aristotle's Prior and Posterior Analytics. A Revised Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), 536.

own theory of science¹¹⁴ without bearing any anti-Xenophanean hint. Still, the opening chapter of Book I of the *Posterior Analytics* (I, 1, 71a29–30) includes a direct reference to Plato's *Meno* 80D–E (see *supra*, 262), which was a Sophistic reformulation of Xenophanes's B34, ll. 2–4; this suggests that Aristotle's remark that one must and, indeed, can – provided one uses Aristotle's own theory of demonstration (which is the subject matter of Book I of the *Posterior Analytics*; probably written before 360 BC)¹¹⁵ – make sure “whether one knows or not . . .” was probably made with the one eye on Xenophanes's criticism of human knowledge.

9.3 *Metaphysics* III, Preface

This connection is rendered more probable by the fact that, as has been recently suggested by André Laks,¹¹⁶ Aristotle seems to allude to Xenophanes's B34 in the Proem of his *Metaphysics* III (1,3, 995a33–b1), where the need for certainty in knowledge is stressed again:

Διὸ δεῖ τὰς δυσχερείας τεθεωρηκέναι πάσας πρότερον . . . διὰ τὸ τοὺς ζητοῦντας ἄνευ τοῦ διαπορῆσαι πρῶτον ὁμοίους εἶναι τοῖς ποῖ δεῖ βαδίζειν ἀγνοοῦσι, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις οὐδ' εἴ ποτε τὸ ζητούμενον εὔρηκεν ἢ μὴ γινώσκειν· τὸ γὰρ τέλος τούτῳ μὲν οὐ δῆλον, τῷ δὲ προηπορηκότι δῆλον.

This is why one must have considered all the difficulties beforehand . . . because people who inquire without developing the impasses first are like those who do not know where they have to go, and in addition to that, he does not even know whether he has at any given time found what he is looking for or not; for the end is not clear to such a man, whereas to him who has first discussed the difficulties it is clear.¹¹⁷

114 See, e.g., Murat Ayede, “Aristotle on *Episteme* and *Nous*: the *Posterior Analytics*,” *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 36, 1 (1998): 15–46.

115 See Düring, *Aristoteles*.

116 André Laks, “Aporia Zero (*Metaphysics*, B 1, 995a24–995b4),” in *Aristotle: Metaphysics Beta. Symposium Aristotelicum*, ed. Michel Crubellier and André Laks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 25–46, at 44. Laks (*art. cit.*, 45) does not fail to compare the passage from *Metaphysics* to the reference to the Platonic *Meno* in the *Posterior Analytics*.

117 Tr. Laks, *art. cit.*, 27, slightly changed on the basis of the translation by William David Ross, *Aristotle's Metaphysics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924). Alan Code, “Aristotle and the History of Skepticism,” in *Ancient Models of Mind: Studies in Human and Divine Rationality*, ed. Andrea Nightingale and David Sedley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 97–109, at 98–99, discusses this passage in the context of his analysis of Aristotle's anti-Sceptic arguments, but without connecting it with Xenophanes's

Laks rightly points out that Aristotle's οὐδ' εἴ ποτε... imitates Xenophanes's εἰ γὰρ καὶ..., which is a crescendo built on the hypothetical concession that one has reached one's end, i.e. has found the truth (Xenophanes: ... τὰ μάλιστα τύχοι τετελεσμένον εἰπών; Aristotle: ... ποῖ δεῖ βαδίζειν and τὸ ... τέλος). Aristotle's passage is a "quasi-quotation of Xenophanes's fragment,"¹¹⁸ indeed.¹¹⁹ It must not escape our attention that, precisely at that point, Aristotle changes from plural (τοὺς ζητοῦντας... ὁμοίους... τοῖς... ἀγνοοῦσι) to singular (εὗρηκεν... τούτῳ... τῷ... προσηπορηκότι), which is the number used in Xenophanes's fragment throughout (τις ἀνὴρ ἴδεν... τις ἔσται εἰδώς... τύχοι... εἰπών, αὐτὸς... οὐκ οἶδε). Furthermore, Aristotle's image of the traveller who ignores the end (τὸ τέλος) of his own journey may be an echo of Xenophanes's τετελεσμένον; indeed, one of the meanings of τελεῖν is 'to reach one's destination.'¹²⁰ In such a case, τετελεσμένον means any idea that has successfully run the distance between man and the object of knowledge, namely, any idea that fully corresponds to reality.

True, Aristotle is not an intemperate optimist as far as the epistemological possibilities of man are concerned.¹²¹ Still, one can hardly call him a pessimist, especially in view of what he says in *Rhetorics* 1355a15–17 and 37–38.¹²²

10 Cicero

In the early version of Cicero's (106–43 BC) *Academica* (dated to 45 BC), par. 12.44, which is connected with Arcesilaus,¹²³ a list of confessions of ignorance by some Presocratic philosophers is offered, including this phrase:

B34. – Book III of the *Metaphysics* was probably written during Aristotle's early period, i.e., between 367 and 347 BC (see Düring, *Aristoteles*).

118 Laks, "Aporia Zero," 44.

119 Incidentally, the reading 'οὐδ' εἴ ποτε' in 995a36, which has puzzled some scholars, including some of the editors of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, does not seem to me to be a grammatico-syntactical problem. The fully reconstructed passage reads "διὰ τὸ (see 995a34) οὐδὲ γινώσκειν εἴ ποτε τὸ ζητούμενον εὗρηκεν ἢ μή"; "οὐδέ" is a follow-up of the implicitly negative "ἀγνοοῦσι" (995a36) ('not knowing' where to go). Besides, the *lectio* 'οὐδ' εἴ ποτε' is *difficilior* in comparison to the alternative οὐδέποτε, which is attested by some manuscripts, as well as to W. Jaeger's conjectural *emendatio* 'οὐδέ πότερον.'

120 See, e.g., Aeschylus, *Choephoroe* 1021; Sophocles, *Electra* 726; 1435; Thucydides, *Historiae* II, 97, 2; IV, 78, 5.

121 See, e.g., William Wians, "Aristotle and the Problem of Human Knowledge," *International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 2 (2008): 41–64.

122 See Demetracopoulos, "Thomas Aquinas," 381.

123 See, e.g., Jan Opsomer, *In Search of the Truth: Academic Tendencies in Middle Platonism* (Brussels: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, 1998), 162; John M. Cooper,

... *opinionibus* et institutis *omnia* teneri, nihil veritati relinqui ...
 ... *everything* is subject to *opinion* and custom, no room is left for truth ...¹²⁴

As has been remarked by Charles Brittain and John Palmer, this can be seen as a partial echo of Xenophanes's B34, if one takes *opinionibus* as a rendering of δόκος and *omnia* as a paraphrase of the ἐπὶ πάντι (v. 4).¹²⁵ Presumably, *institutis* is Sophistic in origins; it refers to the conventional character of the mass beliefs, in implicit contrast to the more sophisticated opinions of the individuals.¹²⁶

As noted by John M. Cooper, "the pre-Socratic considerations mentioned" in this passage are "expanded upon" in the second edition of the *Academica*, "in 2.72–74, with the addition of Xenophanes and Parmenides to the previous trio of Anaxagoras, Democritus and Empedocles".¹²⁷

Parmenides, Xenophanes...versibus increpant eorum arrogantiam quasi irati, qui, cum sciri nihil possit, audeant se scire dicere.

As for Parmenides and Xenophanes, they criticize almost angrily [...] the arrogance of people who dare to say that they have knowledge, when nothing can be known.¹²⁸

To Brittain, here "Cicero is no doubt thinking of Xenophanes' famous denial of knowledge in fr. B34."¹²⁹ Although there is no verbal similarity to turn this

"Arcesilaus: Socratic and Skeptic," in *Knowledge, Nature and the Good: Essays on Ancient Philosophy*, ed. Cooper (Princeton: University Press, 2004), 81–103, at 85–87.

124 Otto Plasberg, ed., *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*. Fasc. 42: *Academicorum reliquiae cum Lucullo* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1922; repr. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner, 1996), 19, 7–8; tr. Charles Brittain, *Cicero. On Academic Scepticism. Translated, with Introduction and Notes* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2006), 106 (slightly changed).

125 Charles Brittain and John Palmer, "The New Academy's Appeal to the Presocratics," *Phronesis* 46, 1 (2001): 38–72, at 71. On the stages of composition and the date of Cicero's *Academica*, see Brittain, *Cicero*, xi.

126 Cf. Augustine's contrast of the philosophical 'diversae variaeque sententiae' (or 'timidae conjecturae'; cf. Sap. Sol. 9:14: "cogitationes enim mortalium timidae"), such as the doctrines held by philosophers, to the 'opinio populorum' or 'pravae opiniones multitudinis' or 'vulgares errores' (*De vera religione* 11, 2; 111, 3; IV, 6; v, 8); to Augustine, both sorts of heathen beliefs were to be corrected only by the light of Christianity.

127 Cooper, "Arcesilaus," 88.

128 Cicero, *Academica* 11, 23, 74 = Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, I, 116, 13–15 (Plasberg, *M. Tulli*, 63, 3–7); tr. Brittain, *Cicero*, 43.

129 Brittain, *Cicero*, 43, n. 105.

possibility into certainty, this remark becomes plausible in terms of the fact that these Ciceronian lines are an elaboration of par. 12.44 of the earlier redaction of the *Academica*, which does exhibit some verbal similarities.

11 Varro

Varro (116–27 BC), in the beginning of Book XVI of his lost *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, testifies to another version of Xenophanes's B34:

[...] ut Xenophanes Colophonios scribit, quid putem, non quid contendam, ponam; "hominis est enim haec opinari, Dei scire".

As Xenophanes of Colophon writes, I will set down what I think, but not what I am prepared to insist on. "For in these matters man has opinions, but only God has knowledge".¹³⁰

Varro quotes this fragment in the course of his preliminary remarks on the degree to which the reader can accept the various stories about the gods that he is going to expound. He seems to ascribe to Xenophanes a self-relativization of his own views; the sentence *quid putem, non quid contendam, ponam* looks like a loose rendering of vv. 1–3, whose content Varro reproduces and applies to his own case.

130 Varro, *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, fr. 228, ll. 3–5 in Burkhardt Cardauns, *M. Terentius Varro. Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum. Fragmente und Kommentar*, I (Wiesbaden: Steiner Franz, 1976), 98; *apud* Augustine of Hippo, *De civitate Dei* VII, 17, 20–22, in Bernard Dombart and Alfons Kalb, ed., *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De civitate Dei libri I–X. Ad fidem quartae editionis Teubnerianae quam A. MCMXXVIII–MCMXXIX* (CSEL 47; Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), 200 (see also Burkhardt Cardauns, "Varro," in Harald Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics*, I, *Testimonia* [Göteborg: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1967], 291–92, fr. 742; and in II, *Augustine's Attitude* [Göteborg: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1967] at 602–604); tr. William M. Green, *Saint Augustine. The City of God against the Pagans. II: Books IV–VII* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1963; 1965), 437 Karl Deichgräber, "Xenophanes Περὶ φύσεως," *Reinisches Museum für Philologie* 37 (1938): 1–31, at 22. On the place of this fragment in Varro's writing see Henry David Jocelyn, "Varro's *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* and Religious Affairs in the Late Roman Republic," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 65, 1 (1982): 148–205, at 202. This quotation is reproduced in Anonymous's (probably 6th cent. AD) *Contra philosophos* III, 1040–44, in Diethard Aschoff, *Anonymi Contra philosophos* (CCSL 58A; Turnhout: Brepols, 1975), 173. Cf. Guido Turrini, "Il frammento 34 di Senofane e la tradizione dossografica," *Prometheus* 8 (1982): 117–35, at 130–31.

Augustine quotes a fragment from the end of Book xv (*De dis incertis*), too:

Cum in hoc libello dubias de diis opiniones posuero, reprehendi non debeo. Qui enim putabit judicari oportere et posse, cum audierit, faciet ipse. Ego citius perduci possum, ut in primo libro [sc. Book xiv: "De diis certis"] quae dixi in dubitationem revocem, quam in hoc quae perscribam omnia ut ad aliquam dirigam summam.

If in this book I set down uncertain views of the gods I should not be reproved. For if anyone thinks that a definite verdict should and can be given, he will produce one for himself after hearing what I say. As for me, I can sooner be brought to withdraw and leave doubtful what I have said in the first book, than to bring everything that I shall write in this book to any one conclusion.¹³¹

To put the point explicitly, Varro would be more prepared to ascribe a lesser degree of certainty to some probably true theological beliefs than a higher degree of certainty to some doubtful theological beliefs. As Augustine says: *Varro de omnibus dubitare quam aliquid adfirmare maluerit* ("Varro... preferred to be sceptical about everything rather than to affirm anything").¹³² Varro's abstention from positively saying anything about the divine does not seem to have any religious underpinning. Further, it does not seem to have had any philosophical justification. Rather, it resembles the average cultivated man's reluctance to be entangled in such perplexed issues, much less to take sides in debating them.

Augustine quotes this material with polemical purposes. He seeks to make the pagans' religious scepticism evident and thereby repudiate the content of pagan religious claims from the outset. Commenting on the Xenophanean lines, he contrasts *errabunda opinio* ('vagrant belief') and *res opinandae et dubitandae* ("matters of opinion subject to doubt") to *res comprehensae* and *firmissime creditae* ('things understood' and 'absolutely firmly believed').¹³³ Xenophanes's δόχος is implicitly present here, even if Augustine does not see the message of B34 as a lesson of modesty but a confession of the deplorable pagan failure to reach truth on the things divine.

131 Varro, *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, fr. 204; apud Augustine of Hippo, *De civitate Dei*, vii, 17, 7–12, in Dombart and Kalb, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini*, 200; tr. Green, 435.

132 Augustine of Hippo, *De civitate Dei*, vii, 17, 4–5 (Dombart and Kalb, *ibid.*; tr. Green, *ibid.*).

133 Op. cit. vii, 17, 2–3; 22–23 (Dombart and Kalb, op. cit., 200; tr. Green, 435–37).

12 *Arius Didymus*

Another author of that time reproduced B34 in a way partly similar to that of Varro,¹³⁴ yet with the difference that his version has an explicitly religious air. John Stobaeus (5th cent. AD) has preserved the way that Arius Didymus, probably a Stoic doxographer of the 1st century BC¹³⁵ – whose *Epitome* (in what had probably been its complete form, i.e., a set of Logic, Physics, and Ethics)¹³⁶ seems to have enjoyed popularity till the end of the Roman era¹³⁷ – introduced, partly quoted and commented on Xenophanes's B34. Didymus probably drew on earlier doxographic material:

Ξενοφάνους πρώτου λόγος ἦλθεν εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἄξιος γραφῆς, ἅμα παιδιᾷ τάς γε τῶν ἄλλων τόλμας ἐπιπλήττοντος καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ παριστάντος εὐλάβειαν, ὡς ἄρα θεὸς μὲν οἶδε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, “δόκος δ’ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται”. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ φιλοσοφία θῆρα τῆς ἀληθείας ἐστὶ καὶ ὄρεξις· τῶν δὲ φιλοσοφησάντων ἔνιοι εὐρεῖν φασι τὸ θῆραμα, ὡς Ἐπίκουρος καὶ οἱ Στωικοί, οἱ δὲ ἀκμὴν ἔτι ζητεῖν ὡς πού παρὰ θεοῖς ὄν καὶ τῆς σοφίας οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνου χρήματος ὄντος· οὕτως ἔλεγε Σωκράτης καὶ Πύρρων.¹³⁸

Xenophanes was the first to introduce to the Greeks a position worth mentioning: he playfully attacked the audacity of others and portrayed his own caution and piety, declaring that god of course knows the truth but “opinion is allotted to all.” ‘Philosophy’ means seeking after and aspiring for truth. Now of those who philosophized, some claim that they have found what they were hunting, such as Epicurus and the Stoics [sc. the Dogmatics], whereas others say that they are still searching for it, as if it

134 See, e.g., Rivier, “Remarques sur les fragments,” 53, n. 1.

135 See Brad Inwood, “Areios Didymos,” in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, 1: 345–47 (N° 324).

136 See Kahn, “Arius as a Doxographer” in *The Works of Arius Didymus*, 1, 3–13.

137 See Georgios D. Panagopoulos, *Ἡ στωικὴ φιλοσοφία στὴ θεολογία τοῦ Μ. Βασιλείου. Συμβολὴ στὴν ἔρευνα τῶν σχέσεων χριστιανικῆς θεολογίας καὶ ἐλληνικῆς φιλοσοφίας τὸν 4° αἰῶνα* (Ph.D. thesis; Athens 2009), 63–81 et al.; John A. Demetracopoulos, *Eunomius of Cyzicus: A Restoration of his Philosophical Theology* (forthcoming).

138 Xenophanes, A24 (in Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, 1, 116, 9–12) from Arius Didymus's *Liber de philosophorum sectis* (in Friedrich Wilhelm Allen Mullach, ed., *Fragmenta philosophorum Graecorum*, 11 [Paris: Didot, 1867; repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1968], 53b16–20) *apud* John Stobaeus's *Eclogae* 11, 1, 17 (in Curtius Wachsmuth and Otto Hense, ed., *Joannis Stobaei Anthologium*, 11 [Berlin: Weidmann, 1884; repr. 1958], 6, 13–18).

abides in the realm of gods and is not a thing among humans; the latter is what Socrates and Pyrrho said [sc. the Sceptics].¹³⁹

This identification of Xenophanes's 'piety' as the source of his repudiation of human cognitive abilities is similar in tenor to Varro's reproduction of this Xenophanean idea.¹⁴⁰ Further, another theological Xenophanean fragment, B23, which stresses the dissimilarity between man and God and is praised for its pious tenor in Irenaeus of Lyons († 202 AD):... *quemadmodum adest religiosus ac pius dicere de Deo*.¹⁴¹ As Karsten has noted, the phrases that invest Xenophanes's lines in Arius's version (θεός... οἶδε τὴν ἀλήθειαν; Ἡ... φιλοσοφία θήρα τῆς ἀληθείας) of it echo Plato (*Phaedrus* 278D3–6; *Phaedo* 66C2).¹⁴² This idea probably goes back to, or is at least compatible with, Plato's implicit integration of B34 in *Phaedo* (quoted above, 263). There, Simmias says that a man, in spite of the difficulties rooted in the *humana conditio*, should constantly strive to form a consistent view of divine things with the aid of reliable human authorities, unless he has fortunately received from God the privilege to acquire knowledge in some supra-human way. This position implies that man has few chances to reach truth on his own, whereas divine beings possess truth by virtue of their nature.

13 Seneca

A similar declaration of the limited scope of man's knowledge of natural phenomena appears in the *Naturales quaestiones* of Seneca (ca. 1–65 AD), composed near the end of his life:

-
- 139 Tr. Kahn, "Arius," 5, substantially revised. In the context of contrasting man to the divine, "εὐλάβεια" cannot be taken merely in its general sense, as "caution" (an error made by Untersteiner, too, *Senofane*, CCVIII). Rather, it must be seen as mainly having a religious sense (cf. Rivier, "Remarques," 53; Lesher, "The Humanizing," 468). Further, for the correct meaning of "ἐπὶ πᾶσι" see *supra*, 248–250.
- 140 See, e.g., Fränkel, "Xenophanesstudien. II," 190; Zeppi, "Il pensiero," 3–4; Peter Steinmetz, "Xenophanesstudien," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 109, 1 (1966): 13–71, at 39–40; Christian Schäfer, *Xenophanes von Kolophon. Ein Vorsokratiker zwischen Mythos und Philosophie* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1996), 117. Cf. *supra*, 281–282.
- 141 Irenaeus of Lyon, *Adversus haereses* (written ca. 175–85 AD) II, 13, 3; see Jaap Mansfeld, "Compatible Alternatives: Middle Platonist Theology and the Xenophanes Reception" in *Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. Roelof Van Den Broek, Tjitze Baarda and Jaap Mansfeld (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 92–117, at 113–14.
- 142 Karsten, *Xenophanis*, 189. Karsten, writing in 1830, did not know that Stobaeus reproduced Arius; so, he ascribed this Platonic dressing to Stobaeus.

Quae an vera sint, *dii sciunt*, quibus est *scientia veri*. Nobis rimari illa et *conjectura* ire in occulta tantum licet, nec cum fiducia inveniendi nec sine spe.

Whether or not they are true only the gods know, who have knowledge of the truth. We can only investigate these things and grope in the dark with hypotheses, not with the assurance of discovering the truth, and yet not without hope.¹⁴³

It has been plausibly argued¹⁴⁴ that this passage is somewhat close to Arius Didymus's version of Xenophanes's B34 (quoted above, 283). Seneca nuances Didymus's stance by placing himself mid-way between optimism and pessimism.

Of course, Seneca, in a typically Stoic way, makes it clear that, even if we cannot discover the causes of this or that phenomenon, we should not doubt that some cause does exist, because every being as well as every event forms part of the divine plan of the world.¹⁴⁵ Still, elsewhere, arguing as a typical representative of the morally-oriented Stoicism of the Empire era, he says that *involuta veritas in alto latet* ("truth lurks deep in an abyss")¹⁴⁶ and that man neither is qualified nor really needs to know everything about the natural world (*nec licet scire nec prodest*).¹⁴⁷ This, as will immediately be seen, does not differ much from Philo of Alexandria's idea that it is only the creator of the world

143 Seneca, *Naturales quaestiones* VII, 29, 3, ll. 696–698, in Harry M. Hine, *L. Aenaeus Seneca. Naturalium quaestionum libri* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1996), 316–17; tr. Thomas H. Corcoran, *Seneca in Ten Volumes*, VII, *Naturales quaestiones* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), 289–91.

144 Brad Inwood, "God and Human Knowledge in Seneca's *Natural Questions*," in *Traditions of Theology. Studies in Hellenistic Theology, its Background and Aftermath*, ed. Dorothea Frede and André Laks (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 119–57, at 146–48.

145 Seneca, *De providentia* I, 3–4, ll. 18–34, in Giovanni Viansino, ed., *Lucio Anneo Seneca. I dialoghi*, I, *Della provvidenza – Della costanza del saggio – Dell'ira* (Milano: Mondadori, 1988), 29–30.

146 This seems an echo of Democritus's B117: "ἐν βυθῷ ἡ ἀλήθεια" (Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, II, 166, 4). Cf. Cicero, *Academica* I, 12, 44: "... ut Democritus, in profundo veritatem esse demersam"; II, 10, 32: "... naturam, quae in profundo veritatem, ut ait Democritus, penitus abstruserit" (Diels and Kranz, *ibid.*). Cf. Philo of Alexandria, *De somniis* I, 6.

147 Seneca, *De beneficiis*, VII, 1, 5–7.

that knows the secrets of nature and that man should confine himself to have trust to the way God rules the world.¹⁴⁸

14 *Philo of Alexandria*

The contrast between optimism and pessimism about human capacities for knowledge occurs clearly and repeatedly in Philo of Alexandria (ca. 15 BC–ca. 50 AD), who praises those who confess the limits of their gnoseological equipment. Philo was not, of course, a Sceptic,¹⁴⁹ but a ‘Dogmatic’ Platonist. Indeed, he disliked ‘Sceptics,’ whom he understood as persons who confined themselves to studying ‘inferior things’ or to producing merely “word-quibbling and destructive paradox,” i.e., who were practically identical to Plato’s ‘sophists.’ He equally disliked the ‘Sceptical’ method of “opposing all others, forcing them to defend their own dogmata”¹⁵⁰ and, after systematically making the defence fail, replacing the refuted dogmata with nothing.

148 See also the parallels with Philo and Cicero noted by Viansino, *Lucio Anneo Seneca*, 321; 324.

149 See, e.g., David T. Runia, “Philo and Hellenistic Doxography,” in *Philo of Alexandria and Post-Aristotelian Philosophy*, ed. Francesca Alesse (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 13–54, at 50.

150 Harold Tarrant, *Scepticism or Platonism? The Philosophy of the Fourth Academy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 23–24; George H. van Kooten, “Balaam as the Sophist *par excellence* in Philo of Alexandria: Philo’s Projection of an Urgent Contemporary Debate onto Moses’ Pentateuchal Narratives” in *The Prestige of the Pagan Prophet Balaam in Judaism, Early Christianity and Islam*, ed. van Kooten and Jacques T.A.G.M. van Ruiten (Leiden: Brill 2008), 131–61, at 142–43. See Philo of Alexandria, *De congressu eruditionis gratia* 52–53: “[...] Οἱ σκεπτικοὶ [...] μικρὰ [...] σοφίσματα τριβόμενοι καὶ γλισχρολογούμενοι [...]” / “[...] the Sceptics, who [...] spend themselves on petty quibbles and trifling disputes [...]” (Paulus Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, Vol. III [Berlin: Reimer 1898], 82, 11–23; tr. Francis Henry Colson and George Herbert Whitaker, *Philo. With an English Translation*, IV [Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1932; ⁶1985], 483); *De fuga et inventione* 209–13: “Σοφιστοῦ γὰρ βούλημα τοῦτο καὶ λίαν σκεπτικὸν ἐπιμορφάζοντος καὶ λόγοις χαίροντος ἐριστικοῖς. Οὗτος καὶ πάντας βάλλει τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν μαθημάτων, ἰδίᾳ τε ἐκάστῳ καὶ κοινῇ πᾶσιν ἐναντιούμενος” etc. / “For this is just the Sophist’s way, with his pretense of excessive open-mindedness, and his love of arguing for arguing’s sake. This character aims its shafts at all representatives of sciences, opposing each individually and all in common” etc. (Wendland, op. cit., 154, 27–155, 1; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo. With an English Translation*, V [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1934; ⁵1988], 123; this depiction of the Sceptic philosopher looks like an anticipatory description of the writing project of Sextus Empiricus’s *Adversus Mathematicos*); *Quis rerum divinarum haeres sit* at 246–48: “Τὰ δὲ τῶν ἐνσπόνδων εἶναι δυναμένων προσκρούσματα τοιαυτὰ ἐστίν, ὁποίας εἶναι συμβέβηκε τὰς σοφιστῶν δογματικὰς ἐριδας. [...] ἥ δ’ οὐχ ὁμογνωμονοῦσιν ἐν ταῖς κατὰ μέρος ζητήσεσιν, ἐμφυλῶ στάσει χρῆσθαι. [...] Οἱ πάντα ἀκατάληπτα εἰσηγούμενοι τοῖς γνωρίζεσθαι πάμπολλα φάσκουσιν. Καὶ ἥλιος μέντοι καὶ σελήνη καὶ ὁ σύμπαξ οὐρανός, γῆ τε καὶ ἀήρ καὶ ὕδωρ, τὰ τε ἐξ

Philo, however, issues two warnings against temerarious Dogmatism. Embarking upon knowing superior things can be successful only for someone who uses the proper method; of course, proper method is alien to the ‘arrogant’ and ‘argumentative’ spirit of the ‘sophists.’¹⁵¹ Further, even success in this effort has certain limits, due to the unnatural, composite character of human existence: Οὐ γὰρ πάντα θνητῷ γένει γνώριμα (“For all things are not within the ken of mortals”);¹⁵² Θνητὸς οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἰσχύσει τούτων [sc. of the heavenly

αὐτῶν πάντα τοῖς σκεπτικοῖς ἔριδας καὶ φιλονεικίας παρεσχήκασιν [...]. Τὰ δὲ κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν μεστὰ διαφωνίας γέγονε τὸν πιθανὸν καὶ στοχαστικὸν νοῦν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀποδιδρασκούσης· τὸ γὰρ δυσέυρετον καὶ δυσθῆρατον αὐτῆς τὰς λογικάς, ὡς οἶμαι, στάσεις ἐγέννησε” / “But with those who might be allies the causes of offence are such we find in the wranglings of the sophists on questions of dogma. [...] In that they do not agree in their solutions of the particular problems, they may be said to be engaged in civil strife. [...] Those who maintain that everything is beyond our apprehension [...]. And indeed sun and moon and the whole heaven, also air and water and practically all that they produce, have been the cause of strife and contention to the inquirers [...]. The history of philosophy is full of discordance, because truth flees from the credulous mind which deals in conjecture. It is her nature to elude discovery and pursuit, and it is this which in my opinion produces these scientific quarrellings” (Wendland, *op. cit.*, 55, 17–56, 17; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, IV, 407–409). Sophistry, further, is closely linked with “impiety” and ‘godlessness’ (*De posteritate Caini* 52–55, in Wendland, *Philonis*, II, 11, 18–12, 15; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, II [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1927; ⁵1979], 357–59).

- 151 Philo of Alexandria, *De migratione Abrahami* 170–171: “Ἀλλὰ γὰρ δέος ἐστὶν ἀναβαίνειν πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ὄντος θέαν ψυχῇ δι’ ἐαυτῆς ἀγνοοῦσιν τὴν ὁδόν, ὑπὸ ἀμαθίας ἅμα καὶ τόλμης ἐπαρθείσῃ. [...] Διότι πᾶσα κίνησις ἢ ἄνευ θείας ἐπιφροσύνης ἐπιζήμιον, καὶ ἄμεινον ἐνταυθοὶ καταμένειν τὸν θνητὸν βίον ἀλητεύοντας, ὡς τὸ πλεῖστον ἀνθρώπων γένος, ἢ πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐξάραντας ἑαυτοὺς ὑπὸ ἀλαζονείας ἀνατραπῆναι (cf. Is. 14:12)· καθάπερ μυριοὶ συνέβη τῶν σοφιστῶν, οἵτινες ὥηθησαν σοφίαν πιθανὴν εἶναι λόγων εὐρεσιν, ἀλλ’ οὐ πραγμάτων ἀληθεστάτην πίστιν” / “But the soul has reason to fear ascending in its own strength to the sight of Him that is, ignorant as it is of the way, lifted up as it is at once by ignorance and by daring [...]. For loss is entailed by all movement that is not under Divine direction, and it is better to stay where we are, roaming, with the bulk of mankind, through this mortal life, rather than to lift ourselves heavenward and incur shipwreck as imposters. This has been the fate of multitudes of sophists, through their imagining that wisdom consists in finding specious arguments, and not in appealing to the solid evidence of things” (Wendland, *Philonis*, II, 301, 24–302, 6); tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, V, 231–33, slightly modified).

- 152 Philo of Alexandria, *De opificio mundi* 61 (ed. Leopold Cohn and Paul Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, I [Berlin: Reimer, 1896], 20, 6; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, I [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1929; ⁷1991], 47). See also *Quaestiones in “Exodum”* II, fr. 45b (ex John of Damascus’s *Sacra parallela*, PG 96, 472A–B): “Ἀβραὰς καὶ ἀπροσπέλαστος ὄντως ἐστὶν ὁ θεῖος χώρος, οὐδὲ τῆς καθαρωτάτης διανοίας τοσοῦτον ὕψος προσαναβῆναι δυναμένης, ὡς θίξει μόνον ἐπιψαῦσαι” (“The divine realm is really inaccessible

bodies and phenomena] έναργῶς καταλαβεῖν οὐδέν (“The day will never come when any mortal shall be competent to arrive at a clear solution of any of these problems”).¹⁵³

Philo concludes that a man – as a man – must be modest. Even more, a man must distrust himself and his own cognitive powers because of the limits of his condition; he must turn to God as the only trustworthy source of knowledge. Philo makes the transition from Sceptical impasse to refuge in God’s help *expressis verbis*:

Τί οὖν τοῦ φρονεῖν ὀρθῶς ἐστὶ τέλος; Ἀφροσύνην ἑαυτοῦ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ γενητοῦ καταψηφίσασθαι· τὸ γὰρ μηδὲν οἶεσθαι εἰδέναι πέρας ἐπιστήμης, ἐνὸς ὄντος μόνου σοφοῦ, τοῦ καὶ μόνου Θεοῦ.

What, then, is the end of right-mindedness? To pronounce on himself and all created being the verdict of folly; for the final aim of knowledge is to hold that we know nothing, He alone being wise, who is also alone God.¹⁵⁴

and inapproachable; not even the purest mind is capable of ascending so high as to even touch it by hand”); unidentified fr. 2: “Μυρία γε οὐ λέγω τῶν ὑπερόγκων ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν βραχυτάτων εἶναι δοκούντων ἐκφεύγει τὸν ἀνθρώπινον νοῦν. Ἀμήχανον ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν τὸ τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος πρόσωπον θεάσασθαι” (“Many, many things, not only of the highest ones but also of those passing for most humble, escape the human mind. There is no way for the human nature to gaze upon the face of that which really is”); unidentified fr. 4: “Αἱ φιλοσοφαίαι πᾶσαι, κατὰ τε τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ βάρβαρον ἀκμάσαι, ζητοῦσαι τὰ φύσεως οὐδὲ τὸ βραχυτάτον ἡδυνήθησαν τηλαυγῶς ἰδεῖν. Σαφὴς δὲ πίστις αἱ διαφωνίαι καὶ διαμάχαι καὶ ἑτεροδοξίαι τῶν ἐκάστης αἰρέσεως ἀνασκευαζόντων καὶ ἀνασκευαζομένων ἐν μέρει. Καὶ πᾶσιν ὀρμητήρια πολέμων γεγόνασιν αἱ τῶν αἰρεσιομάχων οἰκίαι [ex edit. σκιαί conjeci], τυφλοῦσαι τὸν δυνάμενον βλέπειν ἀνθρώπινον νοῦν ταῖς ἀντιλογικαῖς ἔρισιν, ἀμηχανοῦντα τίνα δεῖ προσέσθαι καὶ τίνα διώσασθαι” (“All philosophical trends, both those that flourished in Greece and in the barbarous lands, had strived to discover the truth on nature yet proved unable to see clearly even the slightest part of reality. This is obviously testified to by the disagreements, quarrels and divergences between sects; all of them have by turns confuted and been confuted by each other. The houses of the defenders of each sect were rendered goads of war, blinding by means of their quarrelsome conflicts the mind that was in principle able to clearly see, who thereby was unable to see which philosophical sect he must approve and which reject”) (ed. Françoise Petit, *Les œuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie. Quaestiones in “Genesis” et in “Exodum”. Fragmenta graeca* [SC 33; Paris: Cerf, 1978], 267; 282; 284).

153 Philo of Alexandria, *De somniis* 1, 21–24 (ed. Wendland, *Philonis*, III, 209, 8–210, 2; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, v, 307). Cf. Turrini, “Il frammento 34,” 130–131.

154 Philo of Alexandria, *De migratione Abraami* 134 (Wendland, *Philonis*, II, 294, 15–18; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, IV, 209).

This claim is only strengthened with regard to our knowledge of the highest being, God:

‘Ο δ’ ἄρα διὰ πόθον ἐπιστήμης ὑπερκύψας ἅπαντα τὸν κόσμον ζητεῖ περὶ τοῦ κοσμοποιοῦ, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ δυσόρατος οὗτος καὶ δυστόπαστος, σῶμα ἢ ἀσώματος ἢ ὑπεράνω τι τούτων ἢ φύσις ἀπλή, οἷα μονάς, ἢ σύγκριμα ἢ τί τῶν ὄντων, καὶ τοῦθ’ ὁρῶν ὡς ἔστι δυσθῆρατον καὶ δυσπερινόητον, εὐχεται παρ’ αὐτοῦ μαθεῖν τοῦ Θεοῦ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός· οὐ γὰρ ἤλπισε δυνήσεσθαι γινῶναι παρ’ ἐτέρου τινὸς τῶν μετ’ αὐτόν.

But the prophet, owing to desire for knowledge, lifts his eyes above the whole universe and becomes a seeker regarding its Creator, asking of what sort this Being is so difficult to see, so difficult to conjecture. Is He a body or incorporeal, or something exalted above these? Is He a single Nature, a Monad as it were? Or a composite Being? What among all that exists? And seeing that this is a problem hard to pursue, hard to take in by thought, he prays that he may learn from God Himself what God is; for he had no hope of being able to ascertain this from another, from one of those who are inferior to Him.¹⁵⁵

Philo, describing the human condition, says that when God created the human race, he knew that its members would be

στοχασταὶ τῶν εἰκότων καὶ πιθανῶν, ἐν οἷς πολὺ τὸ εὐλογον, ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ τῆς ἀκραιφνοῦς ἀληθείας, καὶ ὅτι πιστεύσουσι μᾶλλον τοῖς φαινομένοις ἢ Θεῷ, σοφιστεῖαν πρὸ σοφίας θαυμάσαντες.

¹⁵⁵ Philo of Alexandria, *De fuga et inventione* 164–65 (Wendland, *Philonis*, III, 145, 22–146, 2; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, v, 99). For more Philonic passages on theological apophaticism see, e.g., Dragos A. Giulea, “The Noetic Turn in Jewish Thought,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 42 (2011): 23–57, at 40–43. As I have shown elsewhere (Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 129–50; Appendix: “Gregory the Theologian and Ancient Scepticism”), Gregory Nazianzen’s *Oratio xxviii*, 7–10, which treats the question of the corporeality or incorporeality of God in a typically Ephectic manner, is a direct borrowing from Sextus Empiricus (see *infra*, 331). The affinity of this treatment with Philo’s *De fuga et inventione* 164–65, too, is evident. The parallelism suggests that Gregory’s idea of using this Ephectic examination of the above theological problem was inspired by Philo, who is plainly shown to have amply used Scepticism – well before the Christians did – to show that man is unable to understand God (“οὐ [...] ἤλπισε δυνήσεσθαι γινῶναι”) unless granted this knowledge by God Himself.

[...] intent on what looked probable and plausible, with much in it that could be supported by argument, but would not aim at sheer truth; and how they would trust phenomena rather than God, admiring sophistry rather than wisdom.¹⁵⁶

This description lends a certain fatality to human erring, probably on account of our corporeality. Men can only try to guess truth about the superior things:

Πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τοῦ ἀρίστου τε καὶ τετάρτου τῶν ἐν κόσμῳ σώματος ὄντα, οὐρανοῦ, ἀδελὰ καὶ ἀκατάληπτα, στοχασμοῖς καὶ εἰκασίαις, οὐ παγίῳ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἐφορμούντα· ὥστε κἂν ὁμόσαι τινὰ θαρρήσαντα, ὅτι θνητὸς οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἰσχύσει τούτων ἐναργῶς καταλαβεῖν οὐδέν.

Yes, all these and suchlike points pertaining to heaven, that fourth and best cosmic substance, are obscure and beyond our comprehension, based on guess-work and conjecture, not on the solid reasoning of truth; so much so that one may confidently take one's oath that the day will never come when any mortal shall be competent to arrive at a clear solution of any of these problems.¹⁵⁷

Thus, knowledge offers not clarity but mere plausibility at best. In recompense, faith is the effective way of finding out truth:

Ἄριστον οὖν Θεῷ πεπιστευκέναι καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἀσαφέσι λογισμοῖς καὶ ταῖς ἀβεβαίαις εἰκασίαις.

¹⁵⁶ Philo of Alexandria, *De opificio mundi* 45 (Cohn, *Philonis*, Vol. I, 14, 9–12; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, I, 35, slightly modified).

¹⁵⁷ Philo of Alexandria, *De somniis* I, 23–24 (Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, II, 209, 23–210, 2; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, V, 307). See also id., *De confusione linguarum* 159: “Ἔστι δὲ φύσει πολέμια ταῦτα, στοχασμὸς ἀληθείᾳ” / “There is a natural hostility between conjecture and truth” (Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, II, 259, 22–23; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, IV, 97); *De decalogo* 18: “Αἱ δ’ εἰσὶν ἐν στοχασμοῖς εἰκόσιν αἰτίαι λεγόμεναι περὶ τοῦ διαπορηθέντος· τὰς γὰρ ἀληθεῖς οἶδεν ὁ Θεὸς μόνος” (ed. L. Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, IV [Berlin, 1902], 272, 13–14) / “These are the reasons suggested to answer the question under discussion: they are but probable surmises; the true reasons are known to God alone” (tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo in Ten Volumes*, VII [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1937; ⁵1984], 15).

So then it is best to trust God and not our dim reasonings and insecure conjectures.¹⁵⁸

This position is very close to Sextus Empiricus's interpretation of δόκος in Xenophanes's B34:

... τὸν δοξαστὸν λόγον, τουτέστι τὸν τοῦ εἰκότος ἀλλὰ μὴ τὸν τοῦ παγίου ἐχόμενον.

... the opinionative reason – that is to say, the reason which holds to the probable but not to the certain.¹⁵⁹

Sextus's writings do not antedate Philo's, but Sextus is heavily, if not fully, indebted to an earlier rich vein of Sceptical material¹⁶⁰ that might well have been available to Philo, too. Let us recall that Philo and Sextus are the two of our three sources (along with Diogenes Laertius) for the ten Sceptical modes formulated by Aenesidemus (*fl. ca.* 80/70 BC).¹⁶¹ Indeed, as is well known, Philo – in order to depreciate all the cognitive powers possessed by man in his earthly condition except 'intellect,' as well as every source of knowledge except for Revelation and Platonic philosophy¹⁶² – used some sceptical arguments

158 Philo of Alexandria, *Legum allegoriae* 111, 228 (Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, I, 164, 3–4); tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, I, 457.

159 Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* VII, 110 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 25); tr. Robert Gregg Bury, *Sextus Empiricus in Four Volumes*, II: *Against the Logicians* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1983; 1935), 57.

160 See Diego Machuca, "Sextus Empiricus: His Outlook, Works, and Legacy," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 55, 1–2 (2008): 28–63 (*passim*).

161 Philo of Alexandria, *De ebrietate* 166–170 (Wendland, *Philonis*, II, 202, 6–24). Of the ten modes, Philo reproduced eight. The presence of Aenesidemus's modes in Philo's writing was pointed out by Hans von Arnim, *Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandria* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1888), 53–100. Cf. Tarrant, *Scepticism*, 24–25.

162 As Carlos Lévy puts it, "il y avait déjà à l'époque [...] [de Philon] une articulation assez nette entre scepticisme et transcendance... Philon... inaugure la longue série de ceux qui ont cherché à montrer que la doute systématique et la foi ne sont pas nécessairement contradictoires" ("La conversion du scepticisme chez Philon d'Alexandrie," in Alesse, *Philo of Alexandria*, 103–20, at 120). Bruce W. Winter, *Philo and Paul among the Sophists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1997), 73, n. 47, lists three concrete passages from the *corpus philonicum* as evidence "for Philo's refutation of Sceptic ideas"; yet, I cannot find even the slightest Sceptical relevance in any of them. Likewise, the idea that Philo's reproduction of Aenesidemus's modes does not mean that he endorses them, because, in fact, he just "presents others' arguments in the first person" (Winter, *Philo*, 72–73, n. 47), lacks justification; as far as I can see, this is not the case here.

that were largely borrowed from those ten modes. It is interesting that Philo, prefacing his reproduction of these modes, seems to echo Xenophanes's B34.¹⁶³

... τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης [4] φύσεως μηδαμῇ μηδαμῶς ἰκάνῃς {cf. Xenophanes's "τετελεσμένον"} οὔσης [...] ἐκ περισκέψεως τὸ σαφές [1] εὑρεῖν [...]. Πολὺ γὰρ σκότος {5 *e contrario*} τῶν ὄντων καὶ σωμάτων καὶ πραγμάτων {8–10} κατακεχυμένον οὐκ ἐξ τὴν ἐκάστου {10} φύσιν ἰδεῖν [5].

Human nature is ever quite unable [...] by circumspection to discover certainty. For the vastness of the darkness which overspreads the world of bodies and affairs forbids us to see the nature of each.¹⁶⁴

It may not be a coincidence that Philo accounts for human ignorance in terms of the darkness of the objects to be known, like Sextus Empiricus, who illustrates Xenophanes's B34 with a simile about people looking for jewelry in a pitch dark house.¹⁶⁵ Of course, what in Sextus is just an analogy, in Philo has a metaphysical tenor; darkness means indefiniteness, which is a quality inherent in the sensible world.¹⁶⁶

In sum, Philo, whose intellectual formation took place in the time of the Fourth Academy,¹⁶⁷ held (as we would expect) a form of Platonism considerably

163 Besides, Philo seems to have been somehow acquainted with Xenophanes' theology. See Andrei Lebedev, "Xenophanes on the Immutability of God: A Neglected Fragment in Philo Alexandrinus," *Hermes* 128, 4 (2000): 385–91. Cf. Giovanni Cerri, "Il frammento Lebedev di Senofane (= Xenophan. fr. 47 ('dubium') Gentili-Prato², p. 246)," *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* n.s. 69, 3 (2001): 25–34, at 33–34; republished in Luigi Torraca, ed., *Scritti in onore di Italo Gallo* (Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2002), 177–86.

164 Philo of Alexandria, *De ebrietate* 166 (Wendland, *Philonis*, II, 202, 6–8; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, III [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1968; 1930], 405).

165 Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* VII, 49–54 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 13). See *infra*, 299. On the basis of Sextus's use of B34, Jonathan Barnes, *The Toils of Scepticism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 138, plausibly suggests that this Xenophanean fragment "was plainly a favourite text among ancient Sceptics"; see also Jacques Brunschwig, "The Beginnings of Hellenistic Epistemology," in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, ed. Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld, Malcolm Schofield (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 229–59, at 235, n. 18. Plato applies the simile of darkness to the Presocratic natural theories: "ὁ δὴ μοι φαίνονται ψηλαφῶντες οἱ πολλοὶ ὥσπερ ἐν σκότει..." (*Phaedo* 99B4–5).

166 See, e.g., Philo of Alexandria, *De praemiis et poenis* 36 (Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, V [Berlin: Reimer, 1906], 344, 5–6).

167 See Tarrant, *Scepticism*, 141, n. 14; Jaap Mansfeld, "Philosophy in the Service of Scripture: Philo's Exegetical Strategies," in *The Question of "Eclecticism": Studies in Later Greek*

mitigated by scepticism, and used scepticism to demote man's capacity of knowing the truth and to fill the gap with religious faith and revelation.¹⁶⁸ In this setting, it seems that Philo received Xenophanes's B34 through some earlier sceptical interpretation, unknown to us now. Further, he integrated this interpretation into a religious context: God's providence fashioned a world that admits only of plausible and incomplete explanations; were man able to explain the world perfectly, he would never think that some supernatural cause lies behind it. Thus divine providence protects man from a peculiar sort of 'idolatry,' i.e., from taking the world itself as a self-explained (i.e. divine) entity.¹⁶⁹

Much later on, in the 14th century, Nicephoros Gregoras was to rephrase this passage by adding Xenophanes's emphatic 'no . . . nor . . .' (see *infra*, 361).

15 *Plutarch of Chaeronea*

A vague echo of B34, in the context of underlining the humans' ignorance about divine matters, occurs also in Plutarch of Chaeronea (40/45–120/125 AD). Plutarch definitely knew some version of the fragment, for he quotes Xenophanes by name in showing how difficult it is to reach truth on the divine:

Philosophy, ed. John M. Dillon and Antony Arthur Long (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 70–102, at 102: "Philo really needed the Sceptic aloofness from the theories of dogmatists, because in this way [...] he could begin by, so to speak, neutralizing them and reducing them to the one side in a 'disagreement'". See also David T. Runia, "The Beginnings of the End: Philo of Alexandria and Hellenistic Theology," in Frede and Laks, *Traditions of Theology*, 281–316, at 301–302, where Scepticism is regarded as the cause of Philo's strange challenge to the knowability of the realm of Ideas.

168 See, e.g., Émile Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 3rd ed. (Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard, 1925), 207–19; Max Pohlenz, *Die Stoa. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, II (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1959), 195–98, stressing Philo's rejection of Stoic epistemological optimism; Arthur Hilary Armstrong, "Philo," in *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Armstrong (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 137–57, at 149–50; Carlos Lévy, "Le 'scepticisme' de Philon d'Alexandrie: une influence de la Nouvelle Académie?" in *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*, ed. André Caquot, Mireille Hadas-Lebel, Jean Riaud (Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 29–41, at 34–36; Christopher Stead, *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 57; Adam Kamesar, "Ambrose, Philo, and the Presence of Art in the Bible," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9, 1 (2001): 73–103, at 81–82; Runia, "Philo and Hellenistic Philosophy," 49.

169 Philo of Alexandria, *De opificio mundi* 45–46 (ed. Cohn, *Philonis*, I, 14, 5–15, 7). See Isaac Miller, "Idolatry and the Polemics of World-Formation from Philo to Augustine," *Journal of Religious History* 28, 2 (2004): 126–45, at 134–35.

Ἡ δὲ περὶ ταῦτ' ἀλήθεια καὶ τοῖς μηδὲν ἄλλο πεποιημένοις ἔργον ἢ γνῶσιν καὶ μάθησιν τοῦ ὄντος εὖ μάλα δυσθήρατος ἐστὶ καὶ δύσληπτος [...]. Καὶ τὰ Ξενοφάνους· “Καὶ τὸ μὲν οὖν σαφὲς οὐτὶς ἀνὴρ γένετ' οὐδέ τις ἔσται εἰδὼς ἀμφὶ θεῶν τε καὶ ἄσσα λέγω περὶ πάντων” [...].

The truth about these matters, even for those who have made it their sole business to search out and understand the verities, is exceedingly hard to track down and hard to get hold of [...]. And let the words (...) of Xenophanes [be constantly in mind]: “Never yet was born a man nor ever shall be knowing the truth about the gods and what I say of all things” ...¹⁷⁰

This declaration seems a *verbatim* echo of one of the numerous Philonic statements of the difficulty inherent in human efforts to know God: the divine ‘essence’ is, for Philo, δυσθήρατος καὶ δυσκατάληπτος (“hard to track and hard to apprehend”).¹⁷¹ As has been plausibly suggested,¹⁷² this Philonic passage implies a probably conscious correction of Plato’s celebrated *Timaeus* 28C3–5 (see *supra*, 269) in the direction of rendering Plato’s lines wildly apophatic: ... καὶ ἡ εὐρεσις αὐτοῦ διαφεύγει δύναμιν ἀνθρωπίνην (“even though the discovery [of God] may transcend all human ability”).¹⁷³

Further, before expounding his theodicy in *De sera numinis vindicta*, Plutarch issues the following warning concerning any statement about God:

[...] Ἐν σκοτεινῷ {5 *e contrario*} καὶ πολλοὺς ἐλιγμοὺς καὶ πλάνας ἔχοντι τῷ περὶ θεοῦ [8] λόγῳ [9], καθοδηγῶμεν αὐτοὺς μετ’ “εὐλαβείας” ἀτρέμα πρὸς τὸ εἰκὸς καὶ πιθανόν [cf. Xenophanes’s “δόκος”]· ὥς τό γε σαφές [1] καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν¹⁷⁴ οὐδ’ ἐν οἷς αὐτοὶ πρᾶττομεν ἀσφαλῶς {1; 12} εἰπεῖν [9] ἔχομεν.

170 Plutarch of Chaeronea, *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat* 17D11–F1; tr. F. Cole Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia. With an English Translation*, I, 1A–86A (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1927; ⁵1986), 91.

171 Philo of Alexandria, *De specialibus legibus* I, 36 (Cohn, *Philonis*, v, 9, 17–18; tr. Colson, *Philo*, VII, 119–21).

172 David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the “Timaeus” of Plato* (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 112–13.

173 Tr. Colson, *Philo*, VII, 121.

174 On this hendiadys, see a celebrated passage from Plato’s *Republic* (511E2–4): “ὥσπερ ἐφ’ οἷς ἐστὶν ἀληθείας μετέχει, οὕτω ταῦτα σαφηνείας [...] μετέχειν” / “[...] they participate in clearness and precision in the same degree as their objects partake of truth and reality” (tr. Shorey, *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, VI, 117). Leshner (“Xenophanes’ Scepticism,” 2; 12–13) notes that *σαφής* and *ἀληθής* are not synonyms; he argues from that that “Xenophanes’ Scepticism could be directed toward ‘certain,’ ‘absolute,’ or ‘sure’ knowledge, rather than knowledge of the truth *simpliciter*.” Still, *σαφής* and *ἀληθής* are used as partially

Let us [...], in the argument about God, obscure as it is and abounding in intricacy and error, pick our way cautiously, piously, and calmly to a probable and credible opinion, since not even with regard to what we human beings do ourselves can we speak safely.¹⁷⁵

Plutarch, integrating here some crucial Xenophanean terminology, justifies the fairness of divine providence against its apparent absurdity by means of an *a fortiori* argument from humans' ignorance of the reasons for their own acts.¹⁷⁶ His exhortation to treat of divine things "with caution and piety" may reflect the way Arius Didymus had introduced his quotation of B34: [...] τὴν αὐτοῦ παριστάντος εὐλάβειαν [...] Θεὸς [...] οἶδε τὴν ἀλήθειαν (v. *supra*, 283). Later in the same text, Plutarch, in whose thought εὐλάβεια occupies an important place,¹⁷⁷ highly approves the Academic philosophers for their theological apophaticism, which he takes as a mark of reverence toward God:

Πρῶτον οὖν ὥσπερ ἂφ' ἐστίας ἀρχόμενοι πατρώας τῆς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐλαβείας τῶν ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ φιλοσόφων τὸ μὲν ὡς εἰδότες [7] τι περὶ τούτων [10] λέγειν [9] ἀφοσιωσόμεθα. Πλέον γάρ ἐστι τοῦ περὶ μουσικῶν ἀμούσους καὶ πολεμικῶν ἀστρατεύτους διαλέγεσθαι τὸ τὰ θεῖα [8] καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια πράγματα διασκοπεῖν

overlapping by many authors, the latter one construed in the strong sense of ἀλήθεια (full and established truth on a sector of knowledge) as Stoically opposed to mere ἀληθές (a true yet unfounded statement on some particular issue). Cf., *inter alia*, the passage from Isocrates quoted above (271).

175 Plutarch of Chaeronea, *De sera numinis vindicta* 14, 558D5–9; tr. Philip de Lacy and Benedict Einarson, *Plutarch. Moralia*, VII, *With an English Translation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959; 41994), 243, modified.

176 Cf. Ernesto Valgiglio, "La teologia in Plutarco," *Prometheus* 14 (1988): 253–65, at 256.

177 See, e.g., Daniel Babut, *Plutarque et le stoïcisme. Thèse principale pour le doctorat des lettres présentée à la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de l'Université de Paris* (1969), 516–18. See also John Whittaker, "Plutarch, Platonism, and Christianity" in *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought. Essays in Honour of A.H. Armstrong*, ed. Henry J. Blumenthal and Robert A. Markus (London: Variorum, 1981), 50–63 (= Study xxviii in John Whittaker, *Studies in Neoplatonism and Patristic Thought* [London: Variorum, 1984]), at 51–54, who stresses the distance between God and man in Plutarch's thought, which nevertheless allows for an "optimistic view of the relationship between God and man"; Heinrich Dörrie, "Gnostische Spuren bei Plutarch" in *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions Presented to G. Quispel on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Raymond van den Broek and Maarten J. Vermaseren (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 92–117, at 101–104 (to be read with caution; see Frederik E. Brenk, "An Imperial Heritage: The Religious Spirit of Plutarch of Chaironeia," in Wolfgang Haase, ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 11, 36, 1 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987], 248–349, at 272).

“ἀνθρώπους ὄντας,” οἷον ἀτέχνους τεχνιτῶν διάνοιαν ἀπὸ δόξης καὶ ὑπονοίας κατὰ τὸ εἶδος {14} μετιόντας.

First, then, beginning as from our ancestral hearth with the scrupulous reverence of the philosophers of the Academy for the Deity, we shall disavow any pretension to speak about these matters from knowledge. For it is presumptuous enough for those untrained in music to speak about things musical, and for those of no military experience about war; but it is more presumptuous for mere human beings like ourselves to inquire into the concerns of gods and demons, where we are like laymen seeking to check the thought of experts by the guesswork of opinion and imputation.¹⁷⁸

Here, Plutarch, alluding to Simonidean verses (F260, l. 14)¹⁷⁹ quoted in Aristotle's *Metaphysics* II, 982b30–32 and *Nicomachean Ethics* X, 1177b31–33, as well as to Plato's *Laws* VII, 821A–B, places himself in what he takes to be the tradition of the Platonic Academy and “declares that apophaticism is a salient feature of this tradition by being one of the most important marks of its piety.”¹⁸⁰ Of course, setting aside his pedagogical ‘scepticism’ (which had impressed

178 Plutarch of Chaeronea, *De sera numinis vindicta* 549E5–F2; tr. de Lacy and Einarson, *Plutarch. Moralia*, v11, *With an English Translation* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1959; 41994), 189–91 (slightly modified). It is in the same intellectual milieu that Varro's quotation of B34 sprang in Late Antiquity; see *supra*, 281–282.

179 Orlando Poltera, *Simonides lyricus. Testimonia und Fragmente. Einleitung, kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Basel: Schwabe, 2008), 204.

180 Demetracopoulos, *Πλῆθων*, 102; id., “Georgios Gemistos-Plethon's Dependence on Thomas Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa Theologiae*,” *Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur* 12 (2006): 276–341, at 316–18. To judge from a relatively recent overview of the theodicy in Plutarch's *De sera numinis vindicta* (Silvia Lanzi, *Theos Anaitios. Storia della teodicea da Omero ad Agostino* [Rome: Il Calamo, 2000], at 210–11; see also Mauro Bonazzi, “Plutarch and the Sceptics,” in *A Companion to Plutarch*, ed. Mark Beck (Oxford: Blackwell, 2014), 121–34, at 128, where the two passages from the *De sera numinis vindicta* are discussed), scholarship has not so far embarked upon detecting the sources of Plutarch's lines examined here. On the transcendental character of the divine in Plutarch, see also John Oakesmith, *The Religion of Plutarch: A Pagan Creed of Apostolic Times. An Essay* (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1902), 107; Salvatore Lilla, “La teologia negativa dal pensiero greco classico a quello patristico e bizantino,” *Helikon* 22/27 (1982/87): 211–79; 28 (1988): 203–79; 29–30 (1989/90): 97–186; 31–32 (1991/92): 3–72 at 260–63; Françoise Frazier, “Le *De sera*, dialogue pythique: hasard et providence, philosophie et religion dans la pensée de Plutarque,” in *Tychè et Pronoia. La marche du monde selon Plutarque*, ed. Frazier and Delfim F. Leão (Coimbra: Simões & Linhares, 2010), 69–91,

Montaigne),¹⁸¹ Plutarch can hardly be classified as a real Sceptic.¹⁸² On the other hand, his 'dogmatic' philosophical spirit, imbued with the Stoicism of the 2nd–1st century BC onwards, was not hostile to the universal phenomenon of religious belief; rather, he saw it as a seminal expression of truths about the divine,¹⁸³ the world, and morality, an expression characterised by a strong human feeling of inferiority to the divine.¹⁸⁴ This sense of inferiority does have some affinities with the Sceptical aspect of the contemporary Academy.¹⁸⁵

Plutarch is also often reluctant to accept the various scientific theories of his age. This has been taken as an indication of some kind of scepticism, which

at 78–79; Paul Veyne, "Prodiges, divination et peur des dieux chez Plutarque," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 216, 4 (1999): 387–442, at 432–33.

181 See Nicola Panichi, "Montaigne and Plutarch: A Scepticism that Conquers the Mind," in *Renaissance Scepticisms*, ed. Paganini and Neto, 183–211, at 191–92.

182 See Philip de Lacy, "Plutarch and the Academic Sceptics," *Classical Quarterly* 49 (1953/54): 79–85; Jackson H. Hershbell, "Plutarch's Portrait of Socrates," *Illinois Classical Studies* 13, 2 (1988): 365–81, at 370–71. See also the recent sober account by Bonazzi, "Plutarch," 121–34.

183 See Plutarch of Chaeronea, *Adversus Colotem* 31, 1125D–E: "Εὐροις δ' ἂν ἐπιὼν πόλεις ἀτειχίστους, ἀγραμμάτους, ἀβασιλεύτους, αἰόκους, ἀχρημάτους, νομίσματος μὴ δεομένας, ἀπείρους θεάτρων καὶ γυμνασίων· ἀνιέρου δὲ πόλεως καὶ ἀθέου, μὴ χρωμένης εὐχαῖς μὴδ' ὄρκοις μὴδὲ μαντείαις μὴδὲ θυσίαις ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς μὴδ' ἀποτροπαῖς κακῶν οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν οὐδ' ἔσται γερονῶς θεατής"; "In your travels you may come upon cities without walls, writing, king, houses or property, doing without currency, having no notion of a theatre or gymnasium; but a city without holy places and gods, without any observance of prayers, oaths, oracles, sacrifices for blessings received or rites to avert evils, no traveller has ever seen or will ever see" (ed. Rolf Westman *post* M. Pohlenz, *Plutarchi Moralia*, v1, fasc. 2 [Leipzig: Teubner, 1959], 211, 12–20; tr. Einarson and De Lacy, *Plutarch's Moralia*, xiv, 1086C–1147A [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1981], 301).

184 See, e.g., Bonazzi, "Plutarch," 128–29. Cf. the last lines in Plutarch's *De E apud Delphos* (394C4–7).

185 Cf. Reinhard von Bendemann, "Zur Metaphorik göttlicher Medizin bei Plutarch und im frühen Christentum" (http://www.ev-theol.rud/de/lehrestuehle/von_bendemann/Artikel_ReligionSinne_MetaphorikMedizin.pdf (accessed September 3, 2012), 8). Daniel Babut, "De scepticisme au dépassement de la raison: philosophie et foi religieuse chez Plutarque," in idem, *Parerga. Choix d'articles de Daniel Babut (1974–1994)* (Lyon: Maison de l'Orient, 1994), 549–81, has argued extensively for the central place of Academic Scepticism in Plutarch. Although convincing as far as the Sceptical elements he traces in Plutarch's thought and their connection with his religious spirit (which is relevant to my point here; see also Jan Opsomer, "Plutarch and the Stoics" in *A Companion to Plutarch*, ed. Beck, 88–103, at 99), Babut underestimates the 'Dogmatic' aspect of Plutarch's philosophy. Of course, the issue is somewhat tricky from the outset; recall the well-known critique against Academic Scepticism that there can be no *via media* between the 'Dogmatic' and the 'Sceptical' epistemological stance.

is compatible with the Platonic doctrine of the instability of the processes in the sensible world, which is due to its innate flux, caused by its material constituent.¹⁸⁶ Let us recall that, in that time, even the hard-line ‘dogmatic’ philosophers, i.e. the Stoics, whose school, contrary to Platonism, had never been ‘infected’ by Scepticism, accepted that a lot of natural phenomena cannot be explained and that this is not a real obstacle for one to conduct a philosophical life (see *supra*, 285).

16 *Sextus Empiricus*

Sextus Empiricus (some time between ca. 100 AD and the first half of the 3rd century)¹⁸⁷ does not seem to have been a profound philosopher.¹⁸⁸ Yet, his *œuvre*, rich in information and systematically divided into clearly defined fields and subject matters (an anti-encyclopaedia, it has been aptly called), has emerged as a major source of the Sceptical doctrines both in Late Antiquity and Byzantium, as well as in modern times.

According to Sextus Empiricus, whose account is probably based on Aenesidemus,¹⁸⁹ Xenophanes’s B34 expounds the most ancient of the epistemological theories that deserve to be called ‘Sceptical,’ because he declared that there is nothing that can be understood. Sextus’s interpretation of Xenophanes’s idea that man cannot obtain knowledge, only opinion, has been called ‘internalist,’ inasmuch as it claims that the difference between knowledge and opinion is not that the former is objectively true, whereas the latter is objectively false or only partially true, but that¹⁹⁰ man has no way to check the validity of his statements.¹⁹¹

186 See, e.g., Bonazzi, “Plutarch,” 126–27.

187 On this wide range see Dennis K. House, “The Life of Sextus Empiricus,” *The Classical Quarterly* n.s. 30, 1 (1980): 227–38, at 227–31. According to Victor Brochard’s estimation in *Les sceptiques grecques* (Paris: Vrin, 1923), 314–15, which had become the accepted one, Sextus’s *floruit* must probably be placed about ca. 200 AD or the second half of the 2nd century AD. An illuminating critical survey of our knowledge of Sextus’s life, works and philosophical identity is offered by Machuca, “Sextus” (cf. *supra*, 291, n. 160).

188 See Machuca, *ibid.*

189 See David N. Sedley, “Sextus Empiricus and the Atomist Criterion of Truth,” *Elenchos* 13 (1992): 19–56, at 24–27 (on Sextus’s *Adversus Mathematicos* VII, 49–88).

190 Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* VII, 49–51 (ed. Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 13).

191 On the ‘internalist’ interpretation of the fragment (as opposed to the ‘externalist’ one, which accounts for the human lack of clear knowledge in terms of his inability of having direct access to the object to be known), see Warren, *The Presocratics*, 50–52. Ivan Pozzoni (“Discriminazione, antropomorfismo e ἀγαθὴ σοφίη. Le ramificazioni etiche della narrazione culturale senofanea,” *Información Filosófica* 5 (2008): 27–51, at 36–37)

I have briefly discussed Sextus's relevant illustrations of the 'dark house' and the 'archer' elsewhere.¹⁹² Let me add here that a version of the illustration of the "dark house" occurs in Maximus of Tyre, who uses it in order to describe the strong yet vain aspiration of man for happiness:

... Οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἐτέρῳ ὁμολογεῖ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων, ἀλλὰ πάντες ἔρωτος κοινωνοῦντες ἑνός, τοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἵενται πολλὰς καὶ παντοδαπὰς ὁδοὺς, ἄλλος ἄλλης πράξεως νενεμημένος καὶ μοῖραν καὶ τύχην. Καὶ κοινὸς μὲν πᾶσιν ὁ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ πόθος, τυγχάνει δὲ τοῦ ζητουμένου οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἄλλος ἄλλου· ἀλλὰ ὥσπερ οἱ ἐν σκότῳ χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον μαστεύοντες, ἄποροι ὄντες τοῦ τὸ θηρώμενον ἐλέγξοντος φέγγους, βρίθει καὶ ἐπαφῇ ἄπιστον εἰκασίαν λαβόντες, περιπίπτοντες ἀλλήλοις καὶ διαδάκνοντες, οὔτε ἀφίεναι τολμῶσιν, μὴ ἄρα ἔχωσιν, οὔτε παύσασθαι πονοῦμενοι, μὴ ἄρα οὐκ ἔχωσιν... Καὶ βοῶσιν μὲν πάντες καὶ παιωνίζουσιν, ὡς δῆτα ἐντετυχηκότες τῷ ἀγαθῷ, ἔχει δὲ οὐδεὶς, ὑπὸ δὲ ἀπιστίας τὰ τοῦ πλησίον ἕκαστος εὐρήματα διερευνᾷται... Μυρίων κακῶν ἀνέχονται οἱ ἀνθρώποι δι' οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ δι' ἐλπίδα ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἄγνοιαν. Ἐνέφυσεν γάρ τι ὁ θεὸς ζῶπυρον τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένει τῆς προσδοκίας τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ἀπέκρυψε δὲ αὐτοῦ τὴν εὕρεσιν... Σαφῶς οἶδα ὡς χαλεπὸν εὐρεῖν τὸ χρῆμα τοῦτο "ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι· θεοὶ δέ τε πάντα ἴσασιν" (Homer, *Odyssey* x, 306).

... No two things agree in this world of ours: everyone shares a single desire for the Good, but they make their way towards it by many and various routes, according to the different rank and status of the occupation each has been allotted. Desire for the Good is common to all, but for all that no one man has more success than any other in achieving this goal. They are just like people searching for gold and silver in the dark, unable to secure light to reveal what they are searching for and reduced to fallible guesswork by weight and touch, bumping into each other and snapping at each other, not daring to let go in any case they really have something, nor able to cease their labours in case they have not. [...] Everyone is calling out and shouting in triumph, as if they have stumbled on the Good, though no one actually has it; but at the same time everyone mistrustfully

discusses this internalism in the context of the rise of the distinctively Greek concept of self-consciousness.

192 John A. Demetracopoulos, "Pope Benedict xvi's Use of the Byzantine Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos' *Dialogue with a Muslim Muterizes: The Scholarly Background*," *Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur* 14 (2008): 264–304, at 293–94; id., "Thomas Aquinas," 370–71.

examines his neighbour's findings to be on the safe side. . . . Many thousands of other ills . . . men suffer, from no other cause than their hopes for the Good and their ignorance. God has breathed expectation of the Good into the human race like a spark . . . , but has concealed the Good itself and made it hard to find. . . . I know full well how hard this thing is to find "for mortal men, though gods know all."¹⁹³

The presence of this illustration in the above text (which probably dates from late 2nd century)¹⁹⁴ *eo ipso* suggests that Sextus was not the first – or, at least, not the only – one to use it¹⁹⁵ in the course of an account of Sceptical ideas. Moreover, Maximus stresses the objective character of everyone's having serious difficulties with achieving happiness; these difficulties must be accounted for in terms of the human nature. Still, his description of the *humana conditio* – which he traditionally contrasts with the divine condition – focuses on the fact that nobody knows whether what he pursues makes or would make him happy or not (δι' . . . ἄγνοιαν) and that this is the only thing known clearly (σαφῶς οἶδα). This amounts to an 'internalist' negative approach to the problem of the very possibility for man to achieve knowledge.¹⁹⁶

The 'internalist' interpretation of Xenophanes's B34, which Sextus shares, is implicit in this information preserved by Diogenes Laertius (3rd cent. AD):

Ἐμπεδοκλέους [. . .] εἰπόντος αὐτῷ ὅτι ἀνεύρετός ἐστιν ὁ σοφός, "εἰκότως", ἔφη· "σοφὸν γὰρ εἶναι δεῖ τὸν ἐπιγινωσόμενον τὸν σοφόν".

When Empedocles remarked to him [sc. Xenophanes] that it is impossible to find a wise man, "Naturally," he replied, "for it takes a wise man to recognize a wise man."¹⁹⁷

193 Maximus of Tyre, *Dissertationes* XXIX, 5–6, 109–42 in Michael B. Trapp, ed., *Maximus Tyrius. Dissertationes* (Stuttgart-Leipzig: Saur, 1994), 243–45; tr. id., *Maximus of Tyre. The Philosophical Orations. Translated, with an Introduction and Notes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 42–43.

194 See Trapp, *Maximus Tyrius*, LV–LVIII.

195 To me, the parallels with this illustration listed by Trapp (*Maximus of Tyre*, 243, n. 20) in some other Orations are too remote to be taken as real.

196 On the issue whether Maximus really shared Sceptical views, see George L. Koniaris, "On Maximus of Tyre: Zetemata (1)," *Classical Quarterly* 1, 1 (1982): 87–121, at 106.

197 Xenophanes A1 (Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, 1, 114, 1–2 = Marcovich, *Diogenis*, 644, 14–17; tr. Hicks, *Diogenes*, II, 429).

This utterance is very close to the possible echo of B34 in Plato's *Meno* (*supra*, 262) and to the almost certain echo of B34 in Pseudo-Hippocrates's *On Ancient Medicine* (*supra*, 259–260).

Moreover, even an 'internalist' interpretation has an 'externalist' implication, namely, that human inability to reach certain knowledge is an objective fact that has to do with the human condition. Further, as noted, Sextus may have borrowed the simile of darkness from some Middle Platonic assimilation of Xenophanes's fragment, without, however, its metaphysical implications, which are apparent in Philo of Alexandria (*supra*, 292); Sextus's Sceptical gap between the knower and reality is inferred in an 'internalist' manner. His report that, according to some, B34 asserts that 'everything is inapprehensible,' has been plausibly combined with Diogenes Laertius's report that such a doctrine was attributed to Xenophanes by the first third of the 2nd-century AD Peripatetic, Sotion (in his *Successions of Philosophers*), who, as far as this report is concerned, "depended on an Academic Sceptical tradition."¹⁹⁸ Unlike Varro, Arius Didymus, and Seneca, neither Sotion nor Sextus connect B34 with any religious or pious spirit on Xenophanes's part. Their silence might imply that the 'pious' interpretation of B34 was based on a Sceptical reading of it in 3rd–2nd century BC Academy (possibly by Arcesilaus)¹⁹⁹ and first emerged in the early days of Middle Platonism (1st century BC).²⁰⁰

198 Xenophanes A1 (ed. Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, 114, 3 = Marcovich, *Diogenis*, 644, 17–18). See Turrini, "Il frammento 34" at 125; Jaap Mansfeld, "Theophrastus and the Xenophanes Doxography," *Mnemosyne* 40, 3–4 (1987): 286–312, at 295–97.

199 Mansfeld, "Theophrastus," 295. See also Ioli, "Senofane B 34," 199, n. 1. Anthony Arthur Long, *From Epicurus to Epictetus. Studies in Hellenistic and Roman Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), 70–95, at 87–88, suggests that Timon (*fl.* in the early 3rd cent. BC) might have taken precedence to his shortly later Sotion in seeing Xenophanes, especially his early intellectual career, as a proto-Sceptic.

200 Around the same time with Sextus Empiricus, Galen (129–216 AD), too, reproduced B34; see *De differentia pulsuum* III, 1, in Carl Gottlob Kühn, *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, VIII (Leipzig: Carl Cnoblochii, 1824; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965), 636, 7–637, 2. Galen was fervently interested in gnoseological matters, including the issue of the knowability of things: see, e.g., Robert J. Hankinson, "Galen on the Limitations of Knowledge," in *Galen and the World of Knowledge*, ed. Christopher Gill, Tim Whitmarsh, John Wilkins (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 206–42. Still, the context and the intention of his reproduction of B34 was not philosophical but literary; by including it in the opening paragraph of a book of his *De differentia pulsuum*, he intended to stress the divergence of ideas among people. Yet it is remarkable that Galen often contrasts plausibility ('κατὰ μόνον τὸ πιθανόν') and certain truth or knowledge ('βεβαίως ἐπίστασθαι' or 'ἐπιστημονικὴ γνῶσις') and presents himself as an agnostic of the non-evident matters (see, e.g., Galen, *De propriis placitis* 1–2, in Véronique Boudon-Millot and Antoine Pietrobelli, "Galen

Part II: Uses and Echoes of Xenophanes's B34 in the Greek and Latin Christian Literature of Antiquity and its Pagan Background

Some Christian intellectuals perceived Scepticism as a threat to their religion. Platonism, Stoicism, Aristotelianism, even Epicureanism and Cynicism, were sometimes viewed, in this or that respect, as compatible with Christianity, whereas at other times they were considered at odds with revealed religion because they propounded this or that 'errant' doctrine. In contrast, since Scepticism, both in its negatively Dogmatic and in its 'Ephectic' versions, indiscriminately suspended judgment on or subverted all convictions, it stood as an *a limine* potential refutation of Christianity as well. To mention a famous case, when Augustine of Hippo (354–430) suffered a conclusive philosophical change of mind, the passage was marked by a transition from adherence to Scepticism, to an adherence to firm beliefs on the basis of some 'Platonic' (i.e. Plotinian and Porphyrean) metaphysical and anthropological tenets, which Augustine regarded as potentially yet objectively derivable from God-implemented epistemological principles.²⁰¹ In the religious-theological field, Augustine rephrased Varro's reservation about the truth-value of his description of the traditional Roman gods in order to show that, according to pagan theology, certainty is impossible to reach (cf. *supra*, 282).²⁰²

ressuscité: édition *princeps* du texte grec du *De propriis placitis*," *Revue des Études grecques* 118, 1 [2005]: 168–213, at 172–173, 1; Riccardo Chiaradonna, "Galen and Middle Platonism," in Gill, *Galen*, 243–60, at 245–49). In this context, Galen prefers to quote not Xenophanes's B34 but an adapted version of Protagoras's celebrated agnostic passage (Galen, op. cit. 2, in Boudon-Millot and Pietrobelli, 172, 36–173, 1: "περὶ θεῶν ἀπορεῖν φημι, καθάπερ Πρωταγόρας ἔλεγεν, ἢ καὶ 'περὶ' τούτων 'οἵοιτο' μὲν 'εἶσι' τὴν οὐσίαν ἀγνοεῖν"). Galen insists that certainty is a prerequisite for calling something 'knowledge' (see, e.g., op. cit. 14, in Boudon-Millot and Pietrobelli, 188, 7–13). This is akin to Xenophanes's B34, yet it is much more probable that it reflects the discussions about certainty and probability in the Fourth Academy, probably in line with the preliminary methodological remark in Pseudo-Hippocrates's *On Ancient Medicine* (see *supra*, 260).

201 See, e.g., Christopher Kirwan, *Augustine* (London: Routledge, 1989; 21991), 15–33; John M. Rist, *Augustine* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994; 62000), 41–91; Henrik Lagerlund, "A History of Skepticism in the Middle Ages" in *Rethinking the History*, 5–10. For some nuances to this view of Augustine's overcoming of Scepticism, see George Heffernan, "Eo ipso tempore dubitationis meae" (*Conf.* 5.14.25): Doubt and Quest in Augustine's Conversion Narrative – From Academic Skepticism to Augustinian Skepticism" (<http://www.georgetown.edu/faculty/jod/texts/augskept.doc> ; accessed October 11, 2012).

202 This position is close to Lactantius's critique of the pagan doctrine of gods, regardless of the fact that Lactantius was attacking not heathen religion but heathen philosophy (see *infra*, 316–319).

Further, in pseudo-Clement of Rome's *Homily XIII*, 7, 4 (mid-4th century),²⁰³ Pyrrhonism is mentioned in the following context:

Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐφ' ἡλικίας ἔμφορονος γενόμενοι καὶ τὴν θρησκείαν ἡγαπήσαμεν καὶ τὰ τῆς παιδείας ἐφιλοπονέσαμεν, ὅπως καὶ πρὸς τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη διαλεγόμενοι ἐλέγχειν αὐτὰ περὶ πλάνης δυνώμεθα. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ φιλοσόφων ἡκριβώσαμεν, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τὰ ἀθεώτατα, λέγω δὲ τὰ Ἐπικουροῦ καὶ Πύρρωνος, ἵνα μᾶλλον ἀνασχευάζειν δυνώμεθα.²⁰⁴

We, becoming discrete with our years, were strongly attached to her religion, and we paid good heed to our culture, in order that, disputing with the other nations, we might be able to convince them of their error. We also made an accurate study of the doctrines of the philosophers, especially *the most atheistic* – I mean those of Epicurus and Pyrrho – in order that we might be the better able to refute them.²⁰⁵

203 On the complicated issue of the composition of the *Pseudo-Clementina* (which began in the early 3rd cent. AD) see: Josep Rius-Camps, "Las Pseudoclementinas. Bases filológicas para una nueva interpretación," *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 1 (1976): 79–158, at 152–55; Jan Bremmer, "Pseudo-Clementines: Texts, Dates, Places, Authors and Magic," in *The Pseudo-Clementines*, ed. Jan Bremmer (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 1–23, at 8–9; Jürgen Wehnert, *Pseudoklementinische Homilien. Einführung und Übersetzung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 30–36.

204 Bernhard Rehm and Franz Paschke, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 1, *Homilien*. Fasc. 3, ed. Georg Strecker (GCS 42; Berlin: Akademie, 1953; de Gruyter, 1992), 197, 1–6. The description of Epicureanism as 'mostly atheistic' is probably a loan from Theophilus of Antioch's *Ad Autolycum* III, 7, where Protagoras's theological agnosticism is mentioned, too (in Robert M. Grant, ed., *Theophilus of Antioch. Ad Autolycum. Text and Translation* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970], 106–108).

205 Tr. Peter Peterson, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, VIII, *The Twelve Patriarchs. Excerpts and Epistles. The Clementina. Apocrypha. Decretals. Memoirs of Edessa and Syriac Documents. Remains of the First Ages*, dir. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (New York: Christian Literature Publishing, 1886), 669. Rufinus's Latin translation of the same writing testifies to a different, ampler version of it: "Et Niceta: 'Ego non sum ignarus quae sint definitiones philosophorum... Prae caeteris philosophis Epicuri scholas frequentavi. Frater autem meus Aquila magis Pyrronios secutus est. Alius autem frater noster Platonicos et Aristotelicos'" (Pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Recognitiones* VIII, 6, 4–7, in Georg Strecker post Bernhard Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 11, *Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung* [GCS 51; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994], 221, 6–12). If Sextus Empiricus is to be placed between ca. 100 AD and the first half of the 3rd century (see *supra*, 298, n. 187), whereas the *Recognitiones* dates from the early 3rd century (see Bremmer, "Pseudo-Clementines," 6–9), it follows that this Latin passage is one of the latest pieces (if not the very latest piece) of evidence

The unknown author portrays two Jews, would-be converts to Christianity, who received training in secular knowledge in order to combat the errors of pagans effectively. As far as Epicureanism is concerned, it does not come as surprise that the Jews²⁰⁶ and Christians²⁰⁷ shared the Stoic repudiation of Epicurus's non-Providential theology or even atheism, as well as the repudiation of his so-called hedonism (unfair and misleading though this double repudiation was);²⁰⁸ thus both Jews and Christians describe Epicureanism as one of the two most impious doctrines. What about Scepticism, however – a sect that

on the existence of Scepticism in the ancient world. Julia Annas and Jonathan Barnes regard Gregory Nazianzen's *Oratio* XXI 12 and the emperor Julian's *Epistle* 89b (ed. Joseph Bidez, *L'empereur Julien. Œuvres complètes*, 1, fasc. 2, *Lettres et fragments*, 3rd ed. [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1972], 168, 21–169, 5) as probable “evidence of a resurgence of interest in Scepticism in the fourth century AD”: Julia Annas and Jonathan Barnes, *The Modes of Scepticism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 18. Yet, as I show elsewhere (“Gregory Nazianzen: Sceptic or anti-Sceptic?,” *Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur* 20 [2014]: 116–143, at 117–126), Gregory's passage has nothing to do with Scepticism, whereas Julian's negative evaluation of Pyrrhonism is accompanied by the information that most of the writings of the Pyrrhonian (as well as the Epicurean) sect have been lost (happily, so far as Julian is concerned), thanks to divine providence. So, it seems safe to say that ancient Scepticism was eclipsed some time during the early or mid-3rd century AD.

- 206 See, e.g., Josephus's *Antiquitates Judaicae* x, 277 (ed. Benedictus Niese, *Flavii Iosephi opera*, II, Bks. VI–X [Berlin: Weidmann, 1885], 391). Cf. Willem C. van Unnik, “An Attack on the Epicureans by Flavius Josephus,” in *Romanitas et Christianitas. Studia Iano Henrico Waszink A.D. VI Kal. Nov. a MCMLXXXIII XIII lustra complenti oblata*, ed. Willem den Boer, Pieter G. van der Nat, Christiaan M.J. Sicking, Jacobus C.M. van Winden (Amsterdam: North Holland, 1973), 341–55.
- 207 See, e.g., Justin, *Apologia minor* 7, 3 (ed. Miroslav Marcovich, *Iustini martyris Apologiae pro Christianis. Dialogus cum Tryphone* [PTS 47; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995], 147); Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio* XXVII 10, 6–7 (ed. Paul Gallay and Maurice Jourjon, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27–31: Discours théologiques* [SC 250; Paris: Cerf, 1978], 94); id., *Oratio* IV 72 (PG 35, 596A); id., *Oratio* XXV 6, 2–4 (ed. Justin Mossay and Guy Lafontaine, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 24–26* [SC 284; Paris: Cerf, 1981], 168); id., *Carmina moralia* x (PG 37, 736B); Gregory of Nyssa, *Dialogus de anima et resurrectione* (PG 46, 21B); id., *De deitate Filii et Spiritus sancti* (PG 46, 560B). Howard Jones surveys the Christian reaction to Epicureanism in *The Epicurean Tradition* (London: Routledge, 1989), 94–116. See also Harry Austryn Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers: Faith, Trinity, Incarnation. Third Edition, Revised* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1970), 83–84.
- 208 See, e.g., Dirk Obbink, “The Atheism of Epicurus,” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 30, 2 (1989): 187–223. Of course, some Christians were aware that Epicurus's moral philosophy was not a vulgar hedonism; see, e.g., Maria Rita Pagnoni, “Prime note sulla tradizione medievale ed umanistica di Epicuro,” *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filosofia. Classe di Lettere et di Filosofia*, s. III, 4, 4 (1974): 1443–77, at 1448–51.

held almost nothing for certain? Apparently, Christians found discussion with Sceptics less comfortable than discussion with members of any of the dogmatic sects. For a Dogmatic philosopher's opposition to the content of the disputation as well as to its method produced *de facto* a positive side-effect on a Christian's mind: it implicitly reinforced (or, at least, left intact) the Christian's belief that it is in principle possible for humans to reach truth. By contrast, discussion with a Sceptical philosopher might undermine a Christian's conviction on the legitimacy of holding firm beliefs on all ordinary matters, much less on religious ones. Indeed, the Sceptical stance did not merely challenge some specific part of the Christian intellectual edifice and practice, which Christians could defend with the aid of some other philosophical doctrines; by classifying (Christian) faith as a sort of 'dogmatic' belief, Scepticism undermined faith in its entirety at one blow.²⁰⁹

Yet, the assessment of Scepticism as a *tout-court* subversive stance was only one side of the coin.²¹⁰ In fact, Scepticism was not left out of the early Christian program that was traditionally called *philosophia ancilla theologiae*, after the description by its inventor and legator, Philo of Alexandria. When Christian intellectuals came to the stage, some of them, consciously or not, took over from Philo both the concept and the content of his religion-and-philosophy project, including the mingling of the revealed religion with Scepticism. Scepticism, in this spirit, was seen as a potential ally of faith, and a project that might be called *philosophia Sceptica ancilla theologiae* was inaugurated.

209 See Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 131–32. Gregory Thaumaturgus (ca. 213–ca. 270) relates that his mentor, Origen, initiated him into all the ancient Greek doctrines of the divine except for the atheistic ones that rejected the very existence of God or of divine providence: Gregory Thaumaturgus, *In Origenem oratio panegyrica* XIII, 7–19, 151–52 in Henri Crouzel, ed., *Grégoire le Thaumaturge. Remerciement à Origène, suivi de la lettre d'Origène à Grégoire* (SC 148; Paris: Cerf, 1969), 158. Apparently, the doctrine that rejected divine providence was Epicurus's (see, e.g., Crouzel, op. cit., 159, n. 4; Wolfson, *The Philosophy*, 84), whereas the former one can presumably be taken as Protagoras's or the Sceptics' denial of asserting the existence of the divine. Around the same time, another Platonically-oriented religious thinker, the emperor Julian, fiercely attacked Epicureanism and Scepticism together: "Μήτε Ἐπικούρειος εἰσὶτω λόγος μήτε Πυρρώνειος· ἤδη μὲν γὰρ καλῶς ποιοῦντες οἱ θεοὶ καὶ ἀνηγήκασιν, ὥστε ἐπιλείπειν καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν βιβλίων": Julian, *Epistle* 89, in Bidez, *L'empereur Julien. Œuvres complètes*, I, Part 2, *Lettres et fragments*, 169, 15–23 / "Let us not admit discourses by Epicurus or Pyrrho; but indeed the gods have already in their wisdom destroyed their works, so that most of their books have ceased to be" (tr. Wilmer C. Wright, *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, II [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1913; 1992], 327).

210 Cf., e.g., Werner Post, "Skeptizismus," in *Sacramentum Mundi*, ed. Karl Rahner (Freiburg: Herder, 1969), 576–79, especially 577.

Of early Christian authors writing in Latin, Tertullian (ca. 155–ca. 250),²¹¹ Irenaeus of Lyon,²¹² and Lactantius (second half of the 3rd – first quarter of the 4th cent.)²¹³ represent this stance.²¹⁴

1 *Theophilus of Antioch*

Theophilus of Antioch (second half of the 2nd cent. AD) belongs to the anti-philosophical wing of the Greek Apologists. Books II and III of his only extant work, *Ad Autolycum* (written shortly after 180 AD), launch an attack on both Greek religion and philosophy:

Περὶ κόσμου {10} κτίσεως ἢ περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου, καὶ οὐδὲ τὸ τυχὸν ἔναυσμα ἄξιόν τι τῆς ἀληθείας {1} ἐξείπον {9}. [...] Μωρὸς δὲ καὶ κενὸς ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν φιλοσόφων ἢ συγγραφέων ἢ ποιητῶν) δείκνυται, ὅτι πολλὴ μὲν πληθὺς

211 See, however, some objections to the traditional description of Tertullian as fideist in Thomas D. Carroll, "The Traditions of Fideism," *Religious Studies* 44 (2008): 1–22, at 7.

212 Thomas-André Audet, "Orientations théologiques chez S. Irénée," *Traditio* 1 (1943): 15–54, at 52; Robert M. Grant, "Irenaeus and Hellenistic Culture," *Harvard Theological Review* 42 (1949): 41–51, at 43–47; William Schoedel, "Philosophy and Rhetoric in the *Adversus Haereses* of Irenaeus," *Vigiliae Christianae* 13 (1959): 22–32, at 23–24; Willem C. van Unnik, "Theological Speculation and its Limits" in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition. In honorem R.M. Grant*, ed. William R. Schoedel and Robert L. Wilken (Paris: Beauchesne, 1979), 33–43. I include Irenaeus in the Latin Christian literature, because most of the Greek original of his extant theological production is preserved in Latin translation.

213 Barbara Faes de Mottoni, "Lattanzio e gli Accademici," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité* 94, 1 (1982): 335–77, at 377: "Gli Accademici, attraverso la loro sana opera demolitrice [...], hanno avuto, secondo Lattanzio, una funzione importantissima; hanno infatti liberato l'uomo da ogni presunzione e illusione di conoscenza, lo hanno ridimensionato, quasi proponendo un valore laico dell'umiltà, e attraverso la loro azione critica e dissolutrice di ogni sistema filosofico umano [...], involontariamente hanno indicato la strada che conduce al riconoscimento e all'eccettazione di un sapere e di una verità divini [...]. La disperazione scettica e tutta umana del non conoscere apre così alla dimensione del divino".

214 Of course, the use of Scepticism for justifying Christianity obviously suffers from a *non sequitur*, for the justification applies to any religious faith, i.e., in fact to none. See, for instance, the pagan *persona's* Ephectic defence of (undogmatically) 'prioribus credere' instead of 'nosse familiaris' and 'de numinibus ferre sententiam' in terms of the unsurmountable 'humana mediocritas' and the fruitlessness of the philosophical investigation of "divine matters" in Minucius Felix's *Octavius* V–VI (Jean Beaujeu, *Minucius Felix. Octavius*. [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1974], LXXXII–LXXXV; 81; John H. Randall, *Hellenistic Ways of Deliverance and the Making of Christian Synthesis* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1970], 78–79).

τῆς φλυαρίας αὐτῶν ἐστίν, τὸ τυχόν δὲ τῆς ἀληθείας {1} ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐχ εὕρεται. Καὶ γὰρ εἴ τι [11] δοκεῖ [14] ἀληθές {1} δι' αὐτῶν ἐκπεφωνήσθαι {9}, σύγκρασιν ἔχει τῇ πλάνῃ. [. . .] Ἡ ἐν αὐτοῖς πολυλογία εὕρεται ματαιοπονία καὶ βλάβη.

Concerning the creation of the world and the nature of man, they have emitted not the slightest spark of truth. And the utterances of the philosophers, and writers, and poets have an appearance of trustworthiness on account of the beauty of their diction; but their discourse is proven foolish and idle, because the multitude of their nonsensical frivolities is very great and a stray morsel of truth is hard to be found in them. For even if any truth seems to have been uttered by them, it has a mixture of error.²¹⁵

Theophilus, although strongly opposing philosophers, does not completely deny the possibility that some of them may have reached certain truths. Still, to him, what makes their writings of almost no aid (or even worse: potentially misleading) for anyone aspiring to truth is the fact that truth and verisimilitude are hardly discernible from the error that lurks in their writings. Otherwise put, even if a seeker reaches some truth thanks to the philosophers' help, he cannot know for certain that he has not received some falsehood into his soul as well. The best he can achieve when trying to resolve major cosmological issues is 'conjecture,' which by definition falls short of 'truth.' For instance, concerning the origin of the world, philosophers

... ἀσύμφωνα ἀλλήλοις καὶ φαῦλα ἐξείπον. Πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι τινὲς ἀγένητον τὸν κόσμον ἀπεφήναντο [. . .], καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀγένητον αὐτὸν καὶ αἰδίων φύσιν φάσκοντες οὐκ ἀκόλουθα εἶπον τοῖς γενητὸν αὐτὸν δογματίσασιν. Εἰκασμῷ {14} γὰρ ταῦτα καὶ ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἐννοίᾳ ἐφθέγγαντο, καὶ οὐ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν {14}.

... uttered contradictory and absurd opinions. First, some of them, as we explained before, maintained that the world is uncreated. And those who said it was uncreated and self-producing contradicted those who

215 Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum* 11, 12 (in Grant, *Theophilus of Antioch*, 44–46 = Gustave Bardy, ed., *Théophile d'Antioche. Trois livres à Autolycus* (SC 20; Paris: Cerf, 1948), 130; tr. Marcus Dods, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 11, *Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria*, dir. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, Arthur Cleveland Coxe [New York: Christian Literature Company, 1885; repr. 1975], 185, slightly modified).

propounded that it was created. For by conjecture and human conception they spoke, and not knowing the truth.²¹⁶

This passage seems to reproduce Philo of Alexandria's familiar distinction between στοχασμός τῶν εἰκότων (or εἰκασίαι) and ἀλήθεια (see *supra*, 289). This comes as no surprise for, as has been shown,²¹⁷ Theophilus, especially in his account of the Hexaemeron in Book II of *Ad Autolycum*, owes a lot to Philo, including the doctrine of the ineffability of divine wisdom not only *per se* but also as far as its reflection on Creation is concerned.²¹⁸

Still, despite all the verbal similarities noted above (306–307), we cannot claim that Theophilus realized that Xenophanes lay behind Philo's doctrine of the human inability to grasp God. Theophilus simply belongs among the many thinkers who rejected philosophy because of the contradictory character of its doctrines.

216 Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum* II, 8 (in Grant, op. cit., 34 = Bardy, *Théophile*, 114; tr. Dods, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 179). See also op. cit. III, 16: "...ὁμολογεῖ εἰκασμῶ ταῦτα εἰρηκέναι..." / "...he owns that he has said these things conjecturally..." (in Grant, op. cit., 122 = Bardy, *Théophile*, 236; tr. Dods, 225).

217 Carl Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testaments* (Jena: Hermann Dufft, 1875; repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1970), 340; José Pablo Martín, "La presencia de Filón en el Exámeron de Teófilo de Antioquía," *Salmanticensis* 33, 2 (1986): 147–77, at 155; 172; id., "L'antropología de Filón y la de Teófilo de Antioquía. Sus lecturas de 'Genesis' 2–5," *Salmanticensis* 36, 1 (1989): 23–71; id., "Filón hebreo y Teófilo cristiano: la continuidad de una teología natural," *Salmanticensis* 37, 3 (1990): 301–17. David T. Runia, *Philo and the Church Fathers. A Collection of Papers* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), at 106, n. 6, does not think that Martín's articles conclusively prove Theophilus's direct use of Philo, yet Runia does not defend his reluctance to subscribe to Martín's main point. Other scholars (see, e.g., Xavier Leveils, *Contra Christianos. La critique sociale et religieuse du christianisme des origines au Concile de Nicée (45–325)* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007], 70, n. 301) subscribe to Martín's point.

218 Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum* II, 12: "Τῆς μὲν οὖν ἑξαήμερου οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων δυνατὸς κατ' ἀξίαν τὴν ἐξηγήσιν καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν πᾶσαν ἐξειπεῖν, οὐδὲ εἰ μυρία στόματα ἔχοι καὶ μυρίας γλώσσας. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εἰ μυρίοις ἔτεσιν βιώσει τις ἐπιδημῶν ἐν τῷδε τῷ βίῳ, οὐδὲ οὕτως ἔσται ἱκανὸς πρὸς ταῦτα ἀξίως τι εἰπεῖν, διὰ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος καὶ τὸν 'πλοῦτον' τῆς 'σοφίας' τοῦ 'Θεοῦ' (Rom. 11:33) τῆς οὐσης ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ προγεγραμμένῃ ἑξαήμερῳ" (in Grant, *Theophilus*, 44); "Of this six days' work no man can give a worthy explanation and description of all its parts, not though he had ten thousand tongues and ten thousand mouths; nay, though he were to live ten thousand years, sojourning in this life, not even so could he utter anything worthy of these things, on account of the exceeding greatness and riches of the wisdom of God which there is in the six days' work above narrated" (tr. Dods, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 184).

2 *The Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*

In the *corpus* of the *Pseudo-Clementina*, where Pyrrhonism is seen as a threat to faith as severe as Epicureanism (cf. *supra*, 303), the following attack on the philosophical way of reaching truth is put in St. Peter's mouth:

“Ὅσοι {3/4} ποτέ ἀλήθειαν γνῶναι ἐπεθύμησαν, παρὰ δὲ τούτου [sc. from the prophet] μαθεῖν αὐτὴν οὐκ εὐτύχησαν, μὴ εὐρόντες ζητοῦντες ἐτελεύτησαν. Ὁ γὰρ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ζητῶν παρὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀγνοίας λαβεῖν πῶς ἂν δύναίτο; *Κἂν γάρ* [11] εὖρη, οὐκ εἰδώς [2/7] αὐτὴν ὡς οὐκ οὔσαν παρέρχεται. Οὐτ’ αὖ παρ’ ἐτέρου τοῦ ὁμοίως ἐξ ἀγνοσίας γνῶσιν ἔχειν ἐπαγγελλομένου ἀληθείας κρατεῖν δυνατὸς ἔσται. [...] Πάντες [15; 2/3/4 *e contrario*] μὲν οὖν ὅσοι ποτέ ἐζήτησαν τὸ ἀληθές, τὸ δύνασθαι εὑρεῖν ἑαυτοῖς πιστεύσαντες ἐνηδρεύθησαν. Τοῦτο ὅπερ πεπόνθασιν καὶ οἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων φιλόσοφοι καὶ βαρβάρων οἱ σπουδαιότεροι· ἐκ στοχασμῶν γὰρ ἐπιβάλλοντες τοῖς ὁρατοῖς περὶ τῶν ἀδήλων ἀπεφήναντο, τὸ ὁπῶσποτε παραστάν [cf. “δόκος”] αὐτοῖς, τοῦτο ἀληθές εἶναι νομίσαντες. Ὡς γὰρ εἰδότες ἀλήθειαν οἱ ἀλήθειαν ἔτι ζητοῦντες, τῶν παρισταμένων αὐτοῖς ὑπολήψεων ἃ μὲν ἀποδοκιμάζουσιν, ἃ δὲ κρατύνουσιν ὥσπερ εἰδότες, *μὴ εἰδότες* [2/7] ποῖα μὲν ἐστὶν ἀληθὴ, ποῖα δὲ ψευδῆ. Καὶ δογματίζουσι περὶ ἀληθείας οἱ ἀλήθειαν ζητοῦντες, οὐκ εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ ἀλήθειαν ζητῶν παρὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ πλάνης μαθεῖν αὐτὴν οὐ δύναται. Οὕτε γάρ, ὡς ἔφην, παρεστηκυῖαν αὐτὴν ἐπιγνῶναι δύναται, ἢν ἀγνοεῖ. Πείθει δὲ ἕκαστον ἄφ’ ἑαυτοῦ ζητοῦντα μαθεῖν οὐ πάντως τὸ ἀληθές, ἀλλὰ τὸ τέρπον. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἄλλον ἄλλο τέρπει, ἄλλου ἄλλο κρατεῖ ὡς ἀληθές. Τὸ δὲ ἀληθές ἐστὶ τὸ δοκοῦν τῷ προφήτῃ, οὐ τὸ ἐκάστω ἡδύ· πολλὰ γὰρ ἂν ἦν τὸ ἔν, εἰ τὸ τέρπον ἀληθές ἦν· ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀδύνατον. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων φιλόλογοι (οὐ φιλόσοφοι)²¹⁹ διὰ στοχασμῶν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐπιβάλλοντες πολλὰ καὶ διάφορα ἐδογμάτισαν, τὴν οἰκείαν τῶν ὑποθέσεων ἀκολουθίαν ἀλήθειαν εἶναι νομίσαντες, οὐκ εἰδότες ὅτι αὐτῶν ψευδεῖς ἀρχὰς ἑαυτοῖς ὀρίσαμένων, τῇ ἀρχῇ αὐτῶν τὸ τέλος συμφωνίαν εἴληφεν.

Wherefore, as many as have ever desired to know the truth, but have not had the good fortune to learn it from Him, have not found it, but have died seeking it. For how can he find the truth who seeks it from his own ignorance? And even if he find it, he does not know it, and passes it by as if it were not. Nor yet shall he be able to obtain possession of the truth from another, who, in like manner, promises to him knowledge from ignorance [...] All therefore who ever sought the truth, trusting to themselves to be able to find it, fell into a snare. This is what both the philosophers of the Greeks, and the more intelligent of the barbarians, have suffered.

219 On this sharp contrast see *infra*, 313, n. 229.

For, applying themselves to things visible, they have given decisions by conjecture on things not apparent, thinking that that was truth which at any time presented itself to them as such. For, like persons who know the truth, they, still seeking the truth, reject some of the suppositions that are presented to them, and lay hold of others, as if they knew, while they do not know, what things are true and what are false. And they dogmatize concerning truth, even those who are seeking after truth, not knowing that he who seeks truth cannot learn it from his own wandering. For not even, as I said, can he recognize her when she stands by him, since he is unacquainted with her.

And it is by no means that which is true, but that which is pleasing, which persuades every one who seeks to learn from himself. Since, therefore, one thing is pleasing to one, and another to another, one thing prevails over one as truth, and another thing over another. But the truth is that which is approved by the prophet, not that which is pleasant to each individual. For that which is one would be many, if the pleasing were the true; which is impossible. Wherefore also the Grecian philologers – rather than philosophers – going about matters by conjectures, have dogmatized much and diversely, thinking that the apt sequence of hypotheses is truth, not knowing that when they have assigned to themselves false beginnings, their conclusion has corresponded with the beginning.²²⁰

220 Pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Homily II*, 6, 3–8, 3 (in Strecker and Rehm, ed., *Die Pseudoklementinen*, I, *Homilien* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989], 38, 2–39, 3); tr. Peter Peterson, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, VIII, 478–79. The Pseudo-Clementine Homilies were vulgarized through some epitomes, where both Xenophanes's argument and the term *στοχασμός* were preserved; see *Epitome prior* 22 (ed. Franz Xaver Risch, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, IV, *Die Klemens-Biographie. Epitome prior. Martyrium Clementis. Miraculum Clementis* [GCS, n.s., 16; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008], 19–20); *Epitome auctore Symeone Metaphrasta* 125 (ed. Albert Rudolf M. Dressel, *Clementinorum Epitomae duae* [Leipzig: J.C. Hindrichs, 21873], 84). – This negative evaluation of *στοχασμός*, considered as the cause of disagreement, by Athenagoras (2nd half of the 2nd cent. AD): “Ποιηταὶ μὲν γὰρ καὶ φιλόσοφοι, ὡς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις, ἐπέβαλον στοχαστικῶς, κινήθεντες μὲν κατὰ συμπάθειαν τῆς παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνοῆς ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ ψυχῆς ἕκαστος ζητῆσαι, ‘εἰ’ δυνατὸς ‘εὐρεῖν’ (Act. 17:27) καὶ νοῆσαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τοσοῦτον δὲ δυνηθέντες, ὅσον περινοῆσαι, οὐχ ‘εὐρεῖν’ τὸ ὄν, οὐ παρὰ Θεοῦ περὶ Θεοῦ ἀξιόσαντες μαθεῖν, ἀλλὰ παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἕκαστος· διὸ καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλως ἐδογματίσεν αὐτῶν καὶ περὶ Θεοῦ καὶ περὶ ὕλης καὶ περὶ ἰδεῶν καὶ περὶ κόσμου” (*Legatio pro Christianis* VII, 7, in Miroslav Marcovich, ed., *Athenagoras. Legatio pro Christianis* [PTS 31; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990], 34), must be one of the sources of this pseudo-Clementian passage.

In this anti-pagan attack, which is partially inspired by Theophilus of Antioch,²²¹ Pseudo-Clement pejoratively equates heathen philosophy *en bloc* with στοχασμός and points out two fatal defects in this way of searching for truth. First, its shaky character allows for wishful thinking. In fact, all the Greek (pseudo-)philosophers are deemed to have deceived themselves and their followers by taking for truth whatever each of them would like to be the case.²²² Second, even if it happens that 'by means of conjectures,' a man overcomes all hindrances and reaches truth on some subject, one still could not confirm whether what he says is true or not.

All this discussion is full of Sceptical terms and arguments that, although so far undetected by scholarship,²²³ can be found in Sextus's writings. First of all, for Pseudo-Clement, philosophers ἐδογμάτισαν and believed they had found the truth, whereas in fact they were just ἀλήθειαν ἔτι ζητοῦντες and, contrary to their fancies, ζητοῦντες ἐτελεύτησαν. In other words, they were 'Dogmatics,' whereas, should they have been honest with themselves, they would have entered the Sceptical sect, also called ζητητική, since its adherents ἔτι ζητοῦσιν ('go on inquiring').²²⁴ This precision makes things clear from the outset: Pseudo-Clement implicitly speaks of two philosophical camps, i.e. Dogmatics and Sceptics, and fully condemns the former.

Let us examine, then, the textual sources of Pseudo-Clement's position. His first argument coincides with the core of Xenophanes's B34, at least as we find it in Sextus. It is impossible, Pseudo-Clement argues, for the man who ignores truth to reach truth consciously; for even if he hits upon it, he will still lack the knowledge of truth that he needs in order to recognise that he has hit upon the truth. This position coincides with the Sophistic argument against knowledge expounded in Plato's *Meno* (see *supra*, 262). It also coincides with what Sextus calls διᾱλλήλος τρόπος in his exposition of the fourth Sceptical mode of Aenesidemus²²⁵ as well as in his own refutation of the Dogmatic view that

221 See Strecker *post* Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen*. I, *app. font.*, ad 37, 26 ff.

222 See also Pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Homiliae* I, 3, 3–4: "Αἱ δόξαι τῶν ὑποθέσεων παρὰ τοὺς ἐκδικούντας ψευδεῖς ἢ ἀληθεῖς ὑπολαμβάνονται καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἔχουσιν ἀληθείας φαίνονται. [...] Οὐ παρὰ τὰς ἐκδικουμένας ὑποθέσεις ἢ κατάληψις γίνεται, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοὺς ἐκδικούντας αἱ δόξαι ἀποφαίνονται" (ed. Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen*. I, 24, 4–7).

223 See, e.g., Nicole Kelley's analysis of the above passage in *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines: Situating the "Recognitions" in Fourth Century Syria* (Tübingen: Mohr, 2006), 145; cf. 44.

224 Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* I, 2 (ed. Mau, *Sexti*, I, 4); tr. Robert Gregg Bury, *Sextus Empiricus*, I, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1993; 1933), 3.

225 Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* I, 115 (Mau, *Sexti*, I, 30–31).

truth can be known.²²⁶ Pseudo-Clement's position is also very close to Sextus's argument that "the non-expert cannot become an expert while he is non-expert ... For ... he is like a man blind or deaf from birth. ..."227

Pseudo-Clement's second argument, i.e. wishful thinking, occurs by and large in Sextus. Scrutinizing the possibility that some 'criterion by whom' (ὑφ' οὗ) truth might be judged can be taken for granted, Sextus asks if we might trust the wisest man's arguments and beliefs. He disputes this possibility as follows:

Ἐπεὶ γὰρ μάλιστα οἱ συνετοὶ φιλοῦσιν ἐν τῇ τῶν πραγμάτων κατασκευῇ τοῖς σαθροῖς παριστάμενοι πράγμασιν ὑγιῇ καὶ ἀληθῇ ταῦτα δοκεῖν εἶναι ποιεῖν, ὅταν τι λέγῃ οὗτος ὁ ἀγχίνους, οὐκ εἰσόμεθα πότερόν ποτε, ὡς ἔχει τὸ πρᾶγμα φύσει, οὕτω λέγει, ἢ ψεῦδος αὐτὸ ὑπάρχον ὡς ἀληθὲς παρίστησι καὶ ἡμᾶς πείθει φρονεῖν ὡς περὶ ἀληθοῦς, ἅτε δὴ συνετώτερος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπάντων ὑπάρχων καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐλέγχεσθαι μὴ δυνάμενος. Οὐδὲ τοῦτω τοίνυν συγκαταθησόμεθα ὡς ἀληθῶς τὰ πράγματα κρίνονται, διὰ τὸ οἶόν τε μὲν εἶναι αὐτὸν ἀληθῇ λέγειν, οἴεσθαι δ' ὅτι δι' ὑπερβολὴν ἀγχινοῖας τὰ ψευδῆ τῶν πραγμάτων ὡς ἀληθῇ βουλόμενος παριστὰν ἅ φησι λέγει. Διὰ ταῦτα μὲν οὖν οὐδὲ τῷ τῶν ἀπάντων ἀγχινουστάτῳ δοκοῦντι ὑπάρχειν ἐν τῇ κρίσει τῶν πραγμάτων χρῆ πισεύειν.

Since it is the sagacious above all who, in the construction of their doctrines, love to champion unsound doctrines and to make them appear sound and true, whenever this sharp-witted person makes a statement we shall not know whether he is stating the matter as it really is, or whether he is defending as true what is really false and persuading us to think of it as something true, on the ground that he is more sagacious than all other men and therefore incapable of being refuted by us. So not even to this man will we assent, as one who judges matters truly, since, though it is objectively possible that he speaks the truth, we also suppose that owing to his excessive cleverness he makes his statements with the object of defending false propositions as true. Consequently, in the judgment of

226 Id., *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* II, 85 (Mau, *Sexti*, I, 85–86).

227 Id., *Adversus Mathematicos* I, 33–34 (in Jürgen Mau *post* Hermann Mutschmann, *Sexti Empirici opera*, III, *Adversus Mathematicos libros I–VI continens* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1956], 9); tr. Robert Gregg Bury, *Sextus Empiricus*, IV, *Against the Professors* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1949; 31971), 21, slightly modified. See also id., *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* III, 264 (ed. Mau, *Sexti*, I, 204).

propositions we ought not to believe even the man who is thought to be the most clever of all.²²⁸

Wishful thinking is a psychological process compatible with the Sceptical theory of knowledge. Indeed, if reality and sound ratiocination are *e limine* denied the role of causing one's beliefs (no matter whether the denial is dogmatic or ephectic), then the only force able to lay claim on that causation is the emotional part of the human soul, and particularly its 'appetitive' faculty, since embracing some beliefs is not a remorseful but a positive movement of the soul.

True, Sextus does not make it quite clear whether his 'sagacious man' deceives others on purpose or, as Pseudo-Clement seems to say about his own sage, simply because he has unconsciously deceived himself first.²²⁹ In any case, Pseudo-Clement enriches his argument with some additional material from Sextus (or some common source): describing the arbitrary character of

228 Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* II, 42 (Mau, *Sexti*, I, 74–75); tr. Bury, *Sextus*, I, 179, slightly adapted so as to render the status of the text as it stands in the critical edition.

229 Pseudo-Clement holds that many of those who called themselves great philosophers were not sincere seekers of truth and virtue, but, contrary to what they pretended to be and do, they did not differ from the average man in being motivated by vainglory or wish for making money: "οὐχ οἱ πολλοὶ οὐδὲ οἱ φιλοσοφούντες αὐτοὶ ἅπαντες γνησίως προσέρχονται τῇ τῶν ὄντων κρίσει. Ἰσμεν γάρ πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ μέγα φρονούντων κενοδοξούντας ἢ χρηματισμοῦ χάριν περιβεβλημένους τὸν τρίβωνα καὶ οὐκ ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν" (Pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Homilies* IV, 9, 1–2, in Strecker *post* Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, I, 87, 2–5). A similar critique of the class of philosophers was produced earlier by Cicero (*Tusculanae disputationes* II, 4, 11) as well as, around the same time as Pseudo-Clement, by Lucian (see *infra*, 421–422) and Juvenal (see Ilaria Ramelli, Introduction to Juvenal's *Satirae*, in: ead., *Stoici romani minori: Marco Manilio, Musonio Rufo, Anneo Cornuto, Cheremone di Alessandria, Aulo Persio, Trasea Peto, Anneo Lucano, Decimo Gudio Giovenale, Mara bar Serapion* [Milan: Bompiani, 2008], 2224–25). See also *op. cit.* I, 11, 7 (ed. Strecker, 29, 5): "... ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇτε ὅτι εἰκὴ φιλόλογοι ἐστε καὶ οὐ φιλαλήθεις φιλόσοφοι," which derives *verbatim* from Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone* III, 3: "Φιλόλογος οὖν τις εἰ σύ... φιλεργὸς δὲ οὐδαμῶς οὐδὲ φιλαλήθης" (ed. Edgar J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914], 93; this distinction goes back at least to Chrysippus's fr. III, 682, in Ioannes ab Arnim, ed., *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, III [Leipzig: Teubner, 1903; repr. 1968], 171, 3–5 = Arius Didymus, *Liber de philosophorum sectis*, in Mullach, *Fragmenta*, II, 81a19–25, *apud* John Stobaeus's *Anthologium* II, 7, 11k, in Wachmuth and Hense, *Ioannis Stobaei*, II, 105, 4–6: 'φιλόλογος,' sc. a true lover of the philosophical doctrines, vs. 'λογόφιλος,' sc. a person who exhibits a superficial interest in them). On this distinction see, *inter alia*, John Whittaker, "Platonic Philosophy in the Early Centuries of the Empire" in Wolfgang Haase, ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II, 36, 1, 81–123, at 120; cf. Harold A.S. Tarrant, "Platonic Interpretation in Aulus Gellius," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 37, 2 (1996): 173–93, at 180–82.

the philosophers' convictions, he argues that ἄλλον ἄλλο τέρπει, which results in holding the most diverse opinions on everything. The premise of this argument derives from Sextus's long description of the philosophers' unresolved disagreement on the source of happiness, a disagreement that shows the irrationality of all ethical doctrines. In the course of his arguments, Sextus quotes, *inter alia*, an Homeric verse that is even verbally close to Pseudo-Clement's premise: "Ἄλλος γάρ τ' ἄλλοισιν ἀνὴρ ἐπιτέρπεται ἔργοις" ("One thing is pleasing to one man, another thing to another").²³⁰

Pseudo-Clement connected Scepticism explicitly with divine revelation by saying that truth has been uttered only 'by the prophet,' i.e., by someone to whom God had granted the charisma of knowing and naming the future. In the eyes of all men seeking after truth, such a 'prophet' was absolutely and exclusively reliable.²³¹

All of this discussion is set by Pseudo-Clement in the framework of a general attack on philosophy²³² that is carried out by means of Christian as well as of Sceptical tools. On one hand, Pseudo-Clement goes as far as to say that a demon inspired the entirety of Greek erudition.²³³ On the other hand, he takes refuge in Scepticism, arguing:

Quis enim sermo est, qui non recipiat contradictionem? Et quae argumentatio est, quae non possit alia argumentatione subverti?²³⁴

230 Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, I, 85–112 (Mau, *Sexti*, I, 23–30). Homer's *Odyssey* XIV, 228 is quoted by Sextus in I, 86 (Mau, 24). Sextus also quotes this Homeric verse in the *Adversus Mathematicos* XI, 44 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 385).

231 On the figure of "prophet" (i.e., Jesus Christ) and its superiority to the figure of "philosopher" in the *Pseudo-Clementina* see Kelley, *Knowledge*, 138–46.

232 See Kelley, op. cit., 46–52 (where, however, Pseudo-Clement's rejection of the philosophers' subtle syllogisms is unreasonably seen as influenced by Plato's negative view of sophistry), and 80–81; Christoph Jedan, "Philosophy Superseded? The Doctrine of the Free Will in the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitiones*," in Bremmer, *Pseudo-Clementines*, 200–16, at 200–203 and 210.

233 "Αὐτίκα γοῦν ἐγὼ τὴν πᾶσαν Ἑλλήνων παιδείαν κακοῦ δαίμονος χαλεπωτάτην ὑπόθεσιν εἶναι λέγω" (Pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Homiliae* IV, 12, 1; in Strecker *post* Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, I, 87, 22–24). This must have been the source of Gregory Nazianzen's celebrated description of heathen culture as "δαϊμόνων εὐρημα σκοτεινὸν καὶ διανοίας ἀνάπλασμα κακοδαίμονος" (*Oratio XVII* 3 in PG 36, 336D–337A).

234 Pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Recognitiones* VIII, 61, 5 (Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, II, 256, 9–11). It is possible that the Greek version of these Pseudo-Clementian lines is the source of Gregory Nazianzen's reproduction of this Sceptical maxim (see *infra*, 334).

Which statement is exempt from the possibility of being contradicted? And which argument is not susceptible of refutation by another argument?

This statement is a very close version of the fundamental Sceptical maxim παντι λόγῳ λόγος ἀντίκειται.²³⁵ The uncertainty caused by the vulnerability of all claims and arguments was what had caused to the young Pseudo-Clement the greatest disappointment during his frequentation of the various philosophical schools,²³⁶ a let-down that he described²³⁷ in a way similar to the Sceptics' disappointment upon attending the various philosophical courses (as described by Sextus Empiricus: see *supra*, n. 236).

Still, Pseudo-Clement is not prepared to subscribe to the extreme Sceptical doctrine that nothing can be known at all. Rather, he thinks that this doctrine, which confuses everything and cancels every certainty, is self-refuting: *Quomodo ergo scis, quia non est in hominis potestate scire aliquid, cum hoc ipsum scias?*²³⁸ ("Therefore, how do you know that it is not upon man's power to know anything, since you do know this very thing?").

235 See Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* IX, 74; 76; 102 (Marcovich, *Diogenis*, 685, 13–14; 686, 16; 700, 8); Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes* I, 12; 18; 202–205 (Mau, *Sexti*, I, 7; 50–51; 51–52). An antecedent to this maxim occurs in Aristophanes's description of Socrates's allegedly Sophistic spirit: "καὶ γνωμίδι γνῶμην νύξας [sc. my soul] ἐτέρῳ λόγῳ ἀντιλογῆσαι" (Aristophanes, *Clouds* 321, in Dover, *Aristophanes*, 23). A similar passage in Pseudo-Lysias's *Oratio VIII* II (Christopher Carey, ed., *Lysiae orationes cum fragmentis* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007], 81, 13–14), has been noticed by Dover (op. cit., xxxvii); yet, it does not have any import.

236 Pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Homiliae* I, 3, 1; 3, 3 (Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, I, 23, 22–23; 24, 2–3). This disappointment was described by Sextus (*Adversus Mathematicos*, prol.) and reproduced by Basil of Caesarea (*Ep.* 223, 2; see my "Sextus Empiricus and Basil of Caesarea," *Skepsis* 13/14 [2002/03]: 187–192).

237 Pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Homiliae* I, 1, 3–4, 4: "εἰς τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων ζήτησιν καὶ εὑρεσιν ἡναγκάσθην ἔλθειν. [...] Καὶ οὐθὲν ἕτερον ἑώρων ἢ δογμάτων ἀνασκευὰς καὶ κατασκευὰς καὶ ἔρεις καὶ φιλονεικίας καὶ συλλογισμῶν τέχνας καὶ λημμάτων ἐπινοίας. [...] Τί ματαιοπονῶ; [...] Ἀδῆλου οὖν ὄντος τοῦ πράγματος..." / "I was compelled to come to the search and finding of things. [...] But nought else did I see than the setting up and the knocking down of doctrines, and struggles, and seeking for victory, and the arts of syllogisms, and the skill of assumptions. [...] Why do I labor in vain? [...] Since the matter is uncertain..." (Strecker, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, I, 23, 19–25; 24, 12–13; 24, 21–22; tr. Peterson, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 462–63, slightly changed).

238 Pseudo-Clement of Rome, *Recognitiones* III, 21, 6 (Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, II, 113, 3–7).

3 *Lactantius*

Lactantius reflects Xenophanes's B34 twice. In Book III of the *Divinae institutiones* (probably written in 313 AD),²³⁹ tellingly inscribed as *De falsa sapientia* ("Of the False Wisdom"), Lactantius launches a full-scale attack on philosophy. He justifies the attack by using some tools borrowed from the philosophers themselves, bitterly remarking that philosophers spoke the truth only when stating that they knew nothing.²⁴⁰ To substantiate this thoroughly negative verdict, he argues as follows:

Duabus rebus videtur philosophia constare, *scientia et opinione*, nec ulla re alia. Scientia venire ab ingenio non potest nec cogitatione comprehendere, quia *in se ipso habere propriam scientiam non hominis, sed Dei est*. [...] Superest ut *opinio* in philosophia sola sit: nam unde abest *scientia*, id totum possidet *opinio*. Id enim *opinatur quisque quod nescit*.

Philosophy appears to consist of two subjects, knowledge and conjecture, and of nothing more. Knowledge cannot come from the understanding, nor be apprehended by thought; because *to have knowledge in oneself as a peculiar property does not belong to man, but to God*. [...]. It remains that there is in philosophy *conjecture* only; for that from which *knowledge* is absent, is entirely occupied by *conjecture*. For every one conjectures that of which he is ignorant.²⁴¹

239 See Elizabeth DePalma Digeser, "Lactantius and Constantine's Letter to Arles: Dating the *Divine Institutes*," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2, 1 (1994): 33–52.

240 "... ipsi philosophi suis armis potissimum, quibus placere sibi et confidere solent, opprimerentur a nobis"; "Conabor ostendere numquam illos tam veridicos fuisse quam cum sententiam de sua ignorance dixerunt" (Lactance, *Divinae institutiones* III, 1, 2 and III, 1, 16, in Samuel Brandt, *L. Caeli Firmiani Lactantii opera omnia*, I, *Divinae institutiones et Epitome Divinarum institutionum* [CSEL 19, 1; Prague 1890], 177, 15–17; 179, 18–20 = E. Heck and A. Wlosok, ed., *Lucius Caelius Firmianus Lactantius. Divinarum institutionum libri septem*, fasc. 2, *libri III et IV* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002], 202, 1–3; 204, 11–13).

241 Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* III, 3, 1–2 (Brandt, *L. Caeli*, 181, 12–15 = Heck and Wlosok, 206); tr. William Fletcher, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, VII, *Fathers of the Third and Fourth Centuries. Lactantius – Venantius – Asterius – Victorinus – Dionysius – Apostolic Teaching and Contributions, Homily, and Liturgies*, dir. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (New York: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1886), 142–43. (cf. Anthony Bowen and Peter Garnsey, *Lactantius. Divine Institutes. Translated with an Introduction* [Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2003], 171).

This sharp contrast of human to divine knowledge is redolent of the religious air of Varro's version of Xenophanes's B34 (see *supra*, 281): *Hominis est enim haec opinari, Dei scire*. Even the syntactical structure (subjectum + verbum copulativum + genitivus qualitativus) coincides.²⁴²

Further, Lactantius regards opinion and knowledge as mutually exclusive, which is an implication of the contrast between 'clear truth' (v. 1) and 'opinion' (v. 4) in B34. Moreover, Lactantius degrades human knowledge by noting how unlike the character of truth human existence is. Although he is not so clear on this point, Lactantius seems to say that there is no way for man to make an internal check of the value of this or that claim on truth. Indeed, he explicitly says just that elsewhere in the same book, when producing another argument against philosophers: even if one concedes that it is improbable that none of them has spoken the truth, it is nevertheless objectively impossible to discern who among them has done so (*nescietur quis verum dixerit*).²⁴³ This, at least for the ancient Sceptical reception of B34, is the core of the argument (see 298; 301). In Lactantius's view, this impossibility is radical and insurmountable, for it is rooted in the human condition, in contrast with the divine condition, which includes omniscience and shows that God is the only possible source of knowledge for man.²⁴⁴ To prove his point, Lactantius produces a list of natural

242 On the central place of Varro in Lactantius's project of Christian apologetics see Colin M. Whiting, "The Rhetoric of a Pagan Past: Lactantius and Varro," *Memphis Theological Seminary Journal* 50, 1 (2012) (<http://mtsjournal/memphisseminary.edu/vol-50-1/the-rhetoric-of-a-pagan-past-lactantius-and-varro-by-c-m-whiting> ; accessed November 12, 2012).

243 Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* III, 3, 11 (ed. Brandt, 183, 3–5 = Heck and Wlosok, 208, 7–9).

244 "Nulla in homine potest esse interna et propria scientia ob fragilitatem conditionis humanae" (Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* III, 4, 14; Brandt, 186, 4–5 = Heck and Wlosok, 211, 14–15). See also: "...ignorantiam, quae est conditionis humanae" (II, 16, 8; Heck and Wlosok, 191, ll. 16–17); "modum [...] cogitationis humanae" (III, 6, 17; Brandt, 189, 21–22 = Heck and Wlosok, 216, 4–5); "verum autem scire, divinae est sapientiae, homo autem per se ipsum pervenire ad hanc scientiam non potest, nisi doceatur a Deo" (II, 3, 23; Heck and Wlosok, 122, ll. 14–16); "...Nulla est humana sapientia, si per se ad notionem veri scientiamque nitatur, quoniam mens hominis cum fragili corpore inligata et in tenebroso domicilio inclusa neque liberius evagari neque clarius perspicere veritatem potest, cujus notitia divinae conditionis est... Homo autem non cogitando aut disputando adsequi eam potest, sed discendo et audiendo ab eo, qui scire solus potest et docere. [...] Quare necesse est omnes philosophiae sectas alienas esse a veritate, quia homines erant qui eas constituerunt, nec ullum fundamentum aut firmitatem possunt habere quae nullis divinarum vocum fulciuntur oraculis" (VII, 2, 8–11; Eberhard Heck and Antonie Wlosok,

questions that cannot be answered indisputably, but only by means of conjectures (*disputando et conjecturis*).²⁴⁵

A similar yet succinct statement occurs in his *De ira Dei*:

Philosophi aestimaverunt [...] naturam rerum conjectura posse deprehendi. Quod nequaquam fieri potest, quia mens hominis tenebroso corporis domicilio circumsaepta longe a veri perspectione submota est (cf. Sap. 9:14–16),²⁴⁶ et hoc differt a humanitate divinitas, quod humanitatis est ignoratio, divinitatis scientia.

The philosophers [...] have imagined that the nature of things can be ascertained by conjecture. But this is impossible, because the mind of man, enclosed in the dark abode of the body, is far removed from the perception of truth; and in this the divine nature differs from the human, for ignorance is the property of the human, knowledge of the divine nature.²⁴⁷

Lactantius does not mention Xenophanes by name; he mentions Socrates and the Academic school, particularly Arcesilaus as the head of this school and as *ignorantiae magister*.²⁴⁸ Nonetheless, the verbal similarities between the Lactantian quotations above and the Latin version of B34 in Varro (see *supra*, 281) are noteworthy. As for Lactantius's *conjectura*, which occurs in both of the above passages, it obviously stands either for *στοχασμός*, which is its literal

L. Caelius Firmianus Lactantius. *Divinarum institutionum libri septem*, fasc. 4, *Liber VII. Appendix. Indices* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011], 648, 4–18).

245 Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* III, 3, 5 (Brandt, 182, 3–4 = Heck and Wlosok, 207, 4–5). See also op. cit. III, 8, 29: “earum rerum non est scientia, sed opinatio” (Brandt, 196, 21–22 = Heck and Wlosok, 224, 5–6).

246 This Scriptural passage (“Cogitationes enim mortalium timidae et incertae providentiae nostrae; corpus enim quod corrumpitur adgravat animam et deprimit terrena inhabitatio sensum multa cogitantem, et difficile aestimamus quae in terra sunt, et quae in prospectu sunt invenimus cum labore; quae in caelis sunt autem quis investigavit?”) seems to me closer to Lactantius's lines than the celebrated Platonic passages (as well as the passages from Seneca, Tertullian, and the *corpus Hermeticum*) mentioned by Christiane Ingremeau, *Lactance. La colère de Dieu* (SC 289; Paris: Cerf, 1982), 217 ad loc.; in the Scriptural passage, the dwelling of the human soul in its body is presented as the cause of her ignorance both of the content of the divine mind and of what goes on both on earth and in the sky.

247 Lactantius, *De ira Dei* I, 4 (Ingremeau, *Lactance*, 90); tr. William Fletcher in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, VII, 539, lightly adapted. On the rather inconclusive evidence on the date of the *De ira* (ca. 316?) see Ingremeau, *Lactance*, 25–36; Bowen and Garnsey, *Lactantius*, 3.

248 Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* III, 3, 7; 4, 11; 4, 14; 6, 7 (Brandt, 182, 11–13; 185, 13–14; 186, 4–7; 188, 11–12; 188, 20–22 = Heck and Wlosok, 207, 13–14; 211, 2–4; 214, 9) et al.

equivalent, or for εἰκασμός,²⁴⁹ which can produce only plausible opinions, not certain truths.²⁵⁰

Further, as has been convincingly suggested by Christiane Ingremeau,²⁵¹ the above passage from Lactantius is close to Seneca's *Naturales quaestiones* VII, 29, 3 (quoted *supra*, 285). Presumably, the 'pious' version of B34, which was widespread in the 1st century BC and in the 1st century AD, expressed an idea that fit Lactantius's apologetic purpose well.

In VI, 18, 1, Lactantius mocks the arrogance and/or flagrant stupidity of all philosophers:

Omittamus philosophos, qui aut nihil omnino sciunt idque ipsum pro summa scientia praeferunt, aut qui non perspiciunt etiam quae sciunt, aut qui, quoniam se putant scire quae nesciunt, inepte adroganterque desipiunt.

Let us leave the philosophers; either they know nothing at all, and promote exactly that as the supreme knowledge, or else they do not even understand what they do know, or because they think they know what they don't know, they are futile and presumptuous in their ignorance.²⁵²

As has been plausibly suggested by J. Bryce,²⁵³ the last clause (*aut qui... desipiunt*) must have been derived from Cicero's *Academica* II, 23, 74, i.e., Xenophanes's fr. A25 (see *supra*, 280). If this suggestion is correct, then we can

249 Εἰκασμός has nothing to do with the Lucretian 'animi injectus' or 'animi jactus' (i.e. the Epicurean ἐπιβολή τῆς διανοίας), as suggested by Ingremeau, *Lactance*, 217 ad loc. and accepted by Luca Gaspari (*Lattanzio. La collera di Dio* [Milan: Bompiani, 2011], 153).

250 "... arrogantes vel potius stultos esse qui putent scientiam veritatis conjectura posse comprehendere" (Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* III, 6, 9; Brandt, 188, 21–23 = Heck and Wlosok, 214, 19–20). Lactantius also subscribes to Seneca's view (see *supra*, 285) that the human efforts towards knowledge of the secrets of nature are irrelevant: "philosophi... si aliquid dicunt, nihil prosunt; sive delirant, nihil nocent" (*Divinae institutiones* III, 7, 3; Brandt, 190, 16–18 = Heck and Wlosok, 217, 1–2).

251 Ingremeau, *Lactance*, 217.

252 Heck-Wlosok fasc. 3 (2005), 603; tr. Bowen and Garnsey, *Lactantius*, 368. Cf. Lactantius's bitter mocking of Democritus's 'stupid' idea that "the truth lies sunk down a well-shaft so deep that it has no bottom" (tr. Bowen and Garnsey, 220).

253 Jackson Bryce, *The Library of Lactantius* (New York: Garland, 1990), 56–57. As is amply shown in Bryce's study (see especially 28–60), Cicero is the main source of Lactantius's anti-philosophical arguments. See also Brittain and Palmer, "The New Academy's," 63–64; 71–72.

assume that Lactantius, for all his positive reproduction of Xenophanes's B34 in the Varronian/Senecan version, did not regard Xenophanes as an exception to the depressive rule that *all* philosophers make arrogant claims on truth.²⁵⁴ Still, this is not all. The first clause (*aut nihil... praeferunt*) seems to refer to a different group of philosophers, i.e. the New Academics, who professedly denied the possibility of knowledge, whereas the second (*aut qui... sciunt*) describes some philosophers who, whereas they have found some truths, are not able to see that clearly (*non perspiciunt*)²⁵⁵ – which is very close to the main point of Xenophanes's stress in B34 that *σάφης* is an indispensable and yet unattainable feature of real knowledge.

Last, as has been shown by Brittain and Palmer,²⁵⁶ Lactantius's *Divinae institutiones* III, 28, 10–13, which is a bitter irony against the philosophers' 'stupid' (i.e. self-refuting) confession of ignorance, is a paraphrase of par. 12.44 of the earlier version of Cicero's *Academica*, where a list of such confessions by some Presocratic philosophers is offered. In this list, an echo of Xenophanes's B34 occurs (see *supra*, 280), which includes an express contrast of *opinio* to *veritas*, which is the main point of Lactantius's anti-philosophical stance.

4 *Arnobius of Sicca*

A disciple of Lactantius, Arnobius of Sicca (ca. 255–ca. 327), who had been an anti-Christian before his conversion to Christianity, launches a full-scale attack on pagan philosophers in his *Adversus Nationes* (probably written in 302/305 as a reply to Porphyry's [ca. 234–ca. 305] *Against Christians* and the *De regressu animae*)²⁵⁷ which is very close to Lactantius's. Setting out to show that man does not have *scientia* but only *opinio scientiae*, Arnobius takes it for granted that mortals are unable to obtain a good knowledge of the *divina* ("divine things") and the *naturali obscuritate res mersae* ("things plunged in

254 Bryce, *The Library of Lactantius*, 35.

255 See also Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* III, 1, 1 (in Brandt, 177, 3–6 = Heck and Wlosok, 201, 5–8): "... Veritas in *obscuro* latere adhuc existimatur... Philosophis pravitate ingeniorum turbantibus eam potius quam *illustrantibus*".

256 Brittain and Palmer, "The New Academy's," 70–71.

257 See Pierre Courcelle, "Les sages de Porphyre et les 'viri novi' d'Arnobé," *Revue des Etudes latines* 31 (1953): 257–71. Cf. Michael Bland Simmons, *Arnobius of Sicca. Religious Conflict and Competition in the Age of Diocletian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 93; 157; 217; 319; 324–25.

natural obscurity”) and enumerates several unexplained phenomena even in our ordinary life and activities.²⁵⁸ He then concludes:

Verum infirmitas et inscientia miserabilis hoc magis est, quod *cum* [11] fieri possit (cf. Xenophanes’s ‘τύχοι’) ut *veri* {1; 12} *aliquid* {12} aliquando (cf. Xenophanes’s ‘τύχοι’ again) *dicamus* [9], et hoc ipsum nobis *incertum sit* {4/7}, an *veri* {1; 12} *aliquid* {12} *dixerimus* [9].

But the weakness and wretched ignorance of ours consists even more in this: while it may happen that we at times say something that is true, we cannot be sure even of this very thing, whether we have spoken the truth at all.²⁵⁹

Based on this, Arnobius addresses the usual pagan anti-Christian accusation of irrationality by showing to them that they, too, are lacking knowledge in the proper sense of the term. By and large, Arnobius reproduces the Lactantian line of argument against philosophy *en bloc*:

Suspicionem ergo utimini, non *cognitionis* expressae fide. Quid est autem suspicio, nisi *opinio* rerum *incerta* et in nihil expositum *jaculatio* mentis inlata? Ergo qui suspicatur, non tenet nec in lumine positus cognitionis incedit. Quodsi verum et fixum est, apud rectos et sapientissimos iudices et ista vestra qua fiditis pro *ignoratione* est habenda suspicio.

You are therefore making use of conjecture, not trusting clear information. But what is conjecture, except a doubtful imagining of things, and directing of the mind upon nothing accessible? He, then, who conjectures, does not comprehend, nor does he walk in the light of knowledge. But if this is true and certain, then in the opinion of proper and very wise

²⁵⁸ Since a similar list occurs in Tertullian’s *De anima* 17, it has been suggested that both Apologists exploited some common source (see André Marie Jean Festugière, “Arnobiana,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 6, 1 [1952]: 208–54, at 212–13).

²⁵⁹ Arnobius of Sicca, *Adversus Nationes* 11, 7 in Concetto Marchesi, *Arnobii Adversus Nationes libri VII* (Torino: Paravia, 1953), 71, 22–73, 18 = August Reifferscheid, ed., *Arnobii Adversus Nationes libri VII* (CSEL 4; Vienna: Gerold, 1875), 52, 9–53, 13 (I prefer the reading “verum” to “quorum”); tr. Archibald Hamilton Bryce and Hugh Campbell, *The Seven Books of Arnobius’ Adversus Gentes* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1871), 71, slightly adapted.

judges your conjectures, too, in which you trust, must be regarded as ignorance.²⁶⁰

In this context, Arnobius argues that it is the human – by sharp contrast to the divine – condition itself that, even if one speaks the truth, does not allow one to know that this is the case:

Inanissima igitur res est et supervacui operis, tamquam *scias* [5; 7] aliquid promere, aut velle scire contendere quod, *etsi sit verum* [cf. Xenophanes's “ἐἰ γὰρ καὶ . . . εἰπὼν”], posse videas destrui, aut acceptare pro *vero* id quod *forsitan* [cf. Xenophanes's ‘. . . τύχοι . . . ’] non sit et ex more halucinantium *proferatur* {9}. Et merito res ita est. Non enim divina divinis sed rationibus pendimus et *conjectamus* {14} *humanis* {4} atque ut fieri meruisse quid remur, ita esse oportere contendimus.

It is therefore wholly vain, a useless task, to bring forward something as though you knew it, or to wish to assert that you know that which, even if it is true, you see can be refuted; or to receive that as true which it may be is not, and is brought forward as if by men raving. And it is rightly so, for we do not weigh and guess at divine things by divine, but by human methods; and just as we think that anything should have been made, so we assert that it must be.²⁶¹

Therefore, one cannot help confessing that one is a humble being, which stands absolutely in need of the divine help:

Neque enim promptum est cuiquam Dei mentem videre, aut quibus modis ordinaverit res suas homo animal caecum et ipsum se nesciens ullis potest rationibus consequi: quid oporteat fieri, quando vel quo genere, ipse rerum cunctarum pater, moderator et dominus scit solus.

For it is not within the power of any one to see the mind of God, or the way in which He has arranged His plans. Man, a blind creature, and not knowing himself even, can in no way learn what should happen, when,

260 Arnobius of Sicca, *Adversus Nationes* II, 51, in Marchesi, 125, 2–9 = Reifferscheid, *Arnobii*, 88, 20–26; tr. Bryce and Campbell, 118–19, changed on the basis of Marchesi's edition.

261 Op. cit. II, 57, in Marchesi, 132, 5–13 = Reifferscheid, 93, 19–25; tr. Bryce and Campbell, 126, slightly adapted.

or what its nature is: the Father Himself, the Governor and Lord of all, alone knows.²⁶²

Arnobius is particularly known for going so far as to say that, contrary to what the self-flattering Platonic view that man is divine in origins, “we are living beings either quite like the rest, or separated by no great difference.”²⁶³ In this context, he turns against the dignity of man even the gradual progress of civilization based on human reason; to him, this progress shows that the human nature is fundamentally marked by indigence, because it stands in need of a lot of artificial facilities, which, in addition, never prove sufficient. Making a list of crafts and cultural achievements, Arnobius remarks:

Non sunt ista scientiae munera sed pauperrimae necessitatis inventa. Neque cum animis artes caeli ex penetralibus ceciderunt, sed exquisitae et natae sunt in terris hic omnes et cum processu temporum paulatim meditatione conflatae.

These are not the gifts of science, but the suggestions of the more pressing necessity; nor did the arts descend with men's souls from the inmost heavens, but here on earth have they all been painfully sought out and brought to light, and gradually acquired in process of time by careful thought.²⁶⁴

This might be seen as strikingly redolent of Xenophanes's celebrated B18: Οὔτοι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πάντα θεοὶ θνητοῖς ὑπέδειξαν, ἀλλὰ χρόνῳ ζητοῦντες ἐφευρίσκουσιν ἄμεινον (“Truly, not from the outset did gods reveal all things to the mortals, but in time as they search they discover and invent better”).²⁶⁵

Arnobius, trying to show that one of the dominant heathen accounts for the human ignorance (i.e., the Platonic doctrine of the incarnation of the human

262 Op. cit. II, 74, in Marchesi, 154, 4–9 = Reifferscheid, 108, 25–109, 1; tr. Bryce and Campbell, 144.

263 Arnobius of Sicca, *Adversus Nationes* II, 16, in Marchesi, 84, 8–10 = Reifferscheid, 60, 23–24; tr. Bryce and Campbell, 82.

264 Op. cit. II, 18, in Marchesi, 86, 23–87, 3 = Reifferscheid, 62, 16–20; tr. Bryce and Campbell, 84.

265 Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, I, 133, 13–14; tr. Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, slightly adapted. Leshner has argued against the traditional reading of this fragment as referring to the progress of civilization; see mainly James H. Leshner, “Xenophanes on Inquiry and Discovery: An Alternative to the ‘Hymn to Progress’ Reading of B18,” *Ancient Philosophy* 11 (1991): 229–48. Even if one shares this view, one cannot exclude the possibility that some ancient thinkers construed the fragment in a different way.

souls) is not less irrational than the Christian account of the human condition, describes this doctrine as follows:

Idcirco animas misit, ut inmemores veritatis... ut quae in sedibus propriis mente fuerant una, intellectu et scientia paribus, postquam formas induere mortales, *opinionum* discriminibus dissiderent..., *veritatem* cupientibus noscere rerum opponeretur *obscuritas* et velut oculorum luminibus viduae *nihil certum viderent* et per ancipites semitas *suspicionum* inducerentur errore?

Was it for this that He sent the souls, that being made unmindful of the truth... They which in their own abodes had been of one mind, equals in intellect and knowledge, after that they put on mortal forms, should be divided by differences of opinion... in seeking to know the truth of things, they should be hindered by their obscurity; and, as if bereft of eyesight, should see nothing clearly, and, wandering from the truth, should be lead through uncertain bypaths of fancy?²⁶⁶

Both this description of the fallen souls and a similar description of the unhappy results of the descent of the souls to the corporeal world in 11, 16 present some clear affinities with Macrobius's *Commentary* on Cicero's *Dream of Scipio* 1, 12, 7.²⁶⁷ This, in turn, is known to be very close to a passage from a lost work by Porphyry, which, as will be seen in the next paragraph (326–327), describes the epistemological shortcomings of the incarnated human souls in terms and wording very similar to Xenophanes's B34.

5 *Marius Victorinus and Porphyry apud Macrobius*

As Pierre Hadot has noticed,²⁶⁸ the *Explanations in Ciceronis "Rhetoricam"* by Marius Victorinus (ca. 281/291–ante 386 AD) – a treatise composed before its author's conversion to Christianity ca. 355 AD – bears some Sceptical traces.

266 Arnobius of Sicca, *Adversus Nationes* 11, 39, in Marchesi, 112, 5–21 = Reifferscheid, *Arnobii*, 79, 37–80, 12; tr. Bryce and Campbell, 107–108. See also 11, 10 in Marchesi, 76, 7–13 = Reifferscheid, 55, 5–10; 11, 19 in Marchesi, 89, 7–10 = Reifferscheid, 64, 7–9.

267 On 11, 16, see Ilaria Ramelli in *Macrobio. Commento al Sogno di Scipione. Saggio introduttivo di I. Ramelli. Traduzione, bibliografia, note e apparati di Moreno Neri. In appendice: Marco Tullio Cicerone, Il sogno di Scipione (con testo latino a fronte). Moreno Neri, Sogni e magnanimità nelle arti (con iconografia scipioniana). Paolo Antonio Rolli, Scipione. Pietro Metastasio, Il sogno di Scipione* (Milan: Bompiani, 2007), 29–30; 609–10, n. 213.

268 Pierre Hadot, *Marius Victorinus. Recherches sur sa vie et ses œuvres* (Paris: Institut d'études augustiniennes, 1971), 47–58; id., "Introduction," in *Marius Victorinus. Traités théologiques*

Of the relevant passages quoted by Hadot, the following lines distantly echo Xenophanes's B34:²⁶⁹

... Argumentum necessarium paene non esse solumque esse *inter homines* probabile. Nempe nobis necessarium videtur ex *vero* constare: nam si probabile ex veri simili, ex vero necesse est necessarium. *Inter homines* autem verum latet totumque suspicionibus geritur: ergo necessarium esse non potest argumentum. Sed tantum *inter homines* potest necessarium, quantum secundum *opinionem humanam* valet. [...]

Deinde per id, quod in *opinione* positum est, probabile argumentum sic fit, si ad fidem [...] ea, quae in *opinione* sunt posita, colligamus: si dicas inferos esse et impiis apud inferos poenas... Ergo, ut diximus, ex his quae in *opinione* sunt posita, probabile colligitur argumentum, si dicas inferos esse vel non esse, deos esse vel non esse, mundum natum, mundum non esse natum. Istae *opiniones* 'δόγματα' dicuntur; δοκῶ enim graece 'opinor' et δόγμα 'opinio' nuncupatur. Adeo manifestum est omnia, quae in mundo aguntur, argumentis probabilibus persuaderi, quando etiam philosophorum professionibus ex '*opinione*' nomen impositum est, ut 'δόγματα' dicantur.

There can practically be no necessary arguments among men, but only probable ones. Indeed, as is obvious to us, necessary argument is based on truth; for, if probable argument is based on verisimilitude, necessary argument must be based on truth. But, among men, truth is hidden and everything is approached by means of conjectures. Therefore, there can be no necessary argument. In fact, among men, an argument can be taken as necessary only to the extent that it is valid according to human opinion. [...]

Further, a probable argument is constructed by means of what belongs to the realm of opinion, if we infer convincingly those things that belong to the realm of opinion; if, e.g., you say that there is a lower world and some punishments there inflicted on the impious... So, as we have said, a probable argument is constructed on the basis of those things that belong to the realm of opinion, if you say that 'there is a lower world' or that

sur la Trinité. 1: Texte établi par Paul Henry. Introduction, traduction et notes par Pierre Hadot (sc 68; Paris: Cerf, 1960), 13.

269 Marius Victorinus, *Explanationes in Ciceronis "Rhetoricam"* 1, 29 in Antonella Ippolito, ed., *Marii Victorini Explanationes in Ciceronis "Rhetoricam"* (CCSL 132; Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 137, 57–138, 65; 141, 183–142, 205.

‘there is no lower world,’ that ‘gods exist’ or that ‘gods do not exist,’ that ‘the world is generated’ or ‘the world is not generated.’ These opinions are called ‘δόγματα’; for ‘to opine’ is said in Greek ‘δοκῶ,’ and ‘opinion’ is said ‘δόγμα.’ So, it is manifest that everything that takes place in the world can be seen this way or that by means of probable arguments, since even the philosophers’ declarations have been labelled by the name of ‘opinion so as to be called ‘δόγματα.’

There is no evidence here that Victorinus had B34 before his eyes. Still, some similarities do exist. His repeated *inter homines* corresponds to Xenophanes’s ἐπὶ πᾶσι. Victorinus’s contrast *verum – opinio* corresponds to Xenophanes’s contrast τὸ σαφές – δόκος. Victorinus explicitly identifies *suspicio* as the imperfect method one can use to understand what goes on in things not directly accessible (*Incerta et non apparentia conjecturis vel suspicionibus indagantur*;²⁷⁰ ‘*Suspiciones ducentur: id est conjectura capietur*’;²⁷¹ which is not far from what Xenophanes means by τὸ σαφές and even matches στοχασμός in both its epistemological (cf. *supra*, 319) and rhetorical meaning.²⁷² Victorinus explicitly declares that all philosophical doctrines fall under the clause of δοκεῖν; they are mere opinions.

As Hadot has plausibly suggested,²⁷³ Victorinus’s aphorism *verum latet* was most probably drawn from Porphyry’s lost *Quaestiones Homericae*, where it

270 Marius Victorinus, *Explanations in Ciceronis “Rhetoricam”* I, 8 ll. 72–73 in Ippolito, *Marii*, 49.

271 Op. cit. II, 12 l. 25 in Ippolito, 194. See also op. cit. II, 13. ‘Conjectura’ and ‘suspicio’ are also used interchangeably in Cicero’s *De inventione* II, 31 (Guy Achard, *Cicéron. De l’invention* [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1994], 156–57) as well as in Pseudo-Cicero’s *Rhetorica ad Herennium* II, 3; 10; 11; 23; IV, 53 (Harry Caplan, [Cicero]. *Ad C. Herennium de Ratione Dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium)* [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1954; 21964], 60; 76–78; 100; 362).

272 One can find this meaning of στοχασμός in, e.g., Hermogenes, for whom investigation (‘ζήτημα’) of the truth on a certain forensic case might regard either an evident fact (‘φανερόν’) or a fact to be plausibly reconstructed from evidence. The latter process, whose result might be plausible yet is unavoidably debatable, is called ‘στοχασμός’ (conjecture or guess or indirect conclusion). See Hermogenes of Tarsus, *Περὶ στάσεων* II, 10–11: “Παντὸς οὐτινοσούν προτεθέντος ζητήματος, εἰ συνεστήκοι, ἐπισκοπεῖν δεῖ τὸ κρινόμενον, εἰ ἀφανές ἐστιν ἢ φανερόν. Κἂν μὲν ἀφανές ᾖ, στοχασμός ἐσται· ἐστι γὰρ στοχασμός ἀδήλου πράγματος ἑλεγχος οὐσιώδης” (in Hugo Rabe, *Hermogenis opera* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1913; repr. Stuttgart 1985], 36, 7–11). On *suspicio* as a rendering of στοχασμός see Achard, *Cicéron*, 73, n. 49.

273 Hadot, *Marius Victorinus*, 50–51, n. 123.

was declared that *latet omne verum*,²⁷⁴ which strikingly and, as far as I have checked, exclusively coincides with Victorinus's aphorism.²⁷⁵ Hadot further argues that Victorinus's contrast of truth to opinion is strikingly similar to a passage from Macrobius's (probably late 4th–early 5th cent.)²⁷⁶ *Commentary on Cicero's "Somnium Scipionis,"* which was probably drawn from a passage from Porphyry's lost *Commentary on Plato's "Phaedo"*:

Nam si animae memoriam *rerum divinarum* [8], quarum in caelo *erant consciae* {7}, ad corpora usque deferrent, nulla *inter homines* [4] {15} foret *de divinitate* [8] dissensio; sed oblivionem quidem *omnes* [15] descendendo hauriunt, aliae magis, minus aliae, et ideo in terris, *verum* {1} cum *non* [2] *omnibus* [15] *liqueat* {1}, tamen *opinantur* {14} *omnes* [15] ...

Now if souls were to bring with them to their bodies a memory of the divine things of which they were conscious in the sky, there would be no disagreement among men in regard to divinity; but, indeed, all of them in their descent drink of forgetfulness, some more, some less. Consequently, although the truth is not evident to all on earth, all nevertheless have an opinion...²⁷⁷

274 See Andrew Smith, ed., *Porphyrii philosophi fragmenta. Fragmenta arabica David Wasserstein interpretante* (Stuttgart and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1993), 477, fr. 406F7.

275 One may also think of the opening sentence of Book III of Lactantius's *Divinae institutiones* (in Brandt, *L. Caeli*, 177, 3–4): "...quoniam veritas in obscuro latere adhuc existimatur..." ("...Truth is still thought to lurk in obscurity..."; tr. Bowen and Garnsey, *Lactantius. Divine Institutes*, 168; cf. Bryce, *The Library of Lactantius*, 29). Yet, it is not so probable that Victorinus, when writing a commentary on a rhetorical work during the pagan period of his life, had recourse to a Christian work strongly anti-philosophical in spirit.

276 On the complex issue of the chronology of Macrobius, see the *Forschungsbericht* by Ramelli in *Macrobio*, 7–10.

277 Macrobius, *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis* 1, 12, 9 in James Willis, ed., *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobii Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis. Accedunt quatuor tabulae* (Stuttgart-Leipzig: Teubner, 1994), 49, 17–22; tr. William Harris Stahl, *Macrobius. Commentary on the Dream of Scipio. Translated with an Introduction* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), 135, lightly changed. On Porphyry's *Commentary on "Phaedo"* see Giuseppe Girgenti, *Il pensiero forte di Porfirio. Mediazione fra henologia platonica e ontologia aristotelica. Introduzione di Giovanni Reale* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1996), 122, n. 20; 154–55. Smith (*Porphyrii*, XII, 203; 477 ad l. 7 sq.) is not quite certain that such a Commentary existed; still, I cannot see any real basis for such a doubt. On Porphyry as the main source of Macrobius's *Commentary* see Pierre Courcelle, *Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources*, tr. Harry E. Wedeck (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), 32–46. Jacques Flamant, *Macrobe et*

Porphyry seems here to describe an epistemological aspect of the Platonic *humana conditio* in terms of Xenophanes's B34. Porphyry does not exclude that some people do state the truth; he simply says that truth (described as the content of one's reminiscence from one's pre-bodily life) is not transparent in everybody's eyes, which implies that some have clearly conceived of it. What he notes is that, because of the bodily impediments in our efforts to reach truth, disagreement arises as to which statement about the divine things is the true one, as everybody thinks – with an unqualified degree of certainty – he possesses the truth yet this cannot be so – or, at any rate, in the same degree – for all. Porphyry seems to reproduce even verbally (... δ' ... / ... *sed* ... and ... *tamen* ...) Xenophanes's sharp contrast between clear truth (σαφές ... / ... *liqueat*), which is not possessed by all (*non omnibus* ...), and mere opinion (δόκος ... / *opinantur* ...), which is held by all (... πάνσι τέτυκται / ... *omnes*). What, of course, makes Porphyry's position Platonic rather than Sceptical is that, unlike Xenophanes (v. 1: οὐ τις ἀνὴρ ...), he allows for some people to reach clear truth and, presumably, be conscious of that.

Victorinus, for his part, although he no doubt reflects Porphyry's passage, produced a rhetorical, so to speak, version of it. Standing closer to B34 itself, he avoids admitting that some people do possess the truth; what matters for him as an *explicator* of Cicero's rhetorical treatise is the *dissensio inter homines*, presumably as far as human affairs are concerned, as a bare fact; as for the sublime things, it is Cicero himself who says that they are the object of philosophical, not rhetorical, activity, and Victorinus accepts that.²⁷⁸

Let us further scrutinize Victorinus's case. Victorinus, in his list of the questions that man can hardly resolve, includes the existence of god and the eternity of the world, which he puts under the subject-heading, *quae in mundo aguntur*; likewise, Xenophanes had delineated his subject matter as ἀμφὶ θεῶν and περὶ πάντων. Elsewhere, Victorinus, reproducing Cicero's own lines, includes both natural and ethical questions (such as the shape of the world, the size of the sun, the veracity of the human senses, and the essence of morality) in

le néo-platonisme latin à la fin du iv^e siècle (Leiden: Brill, 1977), at 556–57, argues that, although we can be certain that Macrobius's *Commentary* I, 12, 7–11 (not just I, 12, 7–9, as later suggested by Smith) was mainly based on Porphyry, who drew in turn on Numenius, it is not certain that Macrobius used specifically the *Commentary on "Phaedo"*. See also Ramelli in *Macrobio. Commento*, 29–30. (My thanks to Paul Kalligas for our discussions on the Porphyrean background to Macrobius's passage.)

278 Cicero, *De inventione* I, 6, 8, in Achard, *Cicéron*, 63; Marius Victorinus, *Explanationes in Ciceronis "Rhetoricam"* I, 6, 66–71 (in Ippolito, *Marii*, 42). What Victorinus adds to what Cicero says is that, regardless of the clearly distinct character of rhetorical *quaestio* and philosophical *quaestio*, one and the same person can pursue both tasks.

the ‘theoretical things’ that these intelligent men, the philosophers, speculate about and try hard to resolve.²⁷⁹ Such lists of *quaestiones infinitae* or *θέσεις* occurred in rhetorical writings at least from the 2nd century BC and kept being reproduced till 2nd–3rd century (Hermagoras, Quintilian, Hermogenes et al.).²⁸⁰ Let us recall that Galen offered a list of insoluble matters (*supra*, 302, note 200) partially identical with the list of Cicero, which was commented on by Marius Victorinus.

As has been rightly suggested (in partial yet rather too emphatic disagreement with Hadot), Victorinus’s ‘Scepticism’ should not be seen as identical with the New Academy. Rather

... les thèses de Victorinus relèvent plutôt d’une forme de (néo) platonisme dogmatique intégrant des éléments sceptiques. [...] L’exemple de la foi chrétienne vient confirmer la dévaluation générale frappant l’*opinio*, qui règne en maîtresse sur le monde des hommes.²⁸¹

Victorinus’s statement that we humans can only achieve opinions, i.e., ideas that are only ‘probable’ or ‘resemble truth,’ implies that knowledge of truth occurs only in the divine realm. This position is very close to the way that Arius Didymus quotes B34 and that Seneca and Lactantius echo B34 (see *supra*, 283–286; 318). It also squares with Victorinus’s apophatic definition of God:

Cum quid sit Deus nullo modo scire possimus, sublatio omnium existentium, quae Graeci *ὑπὲρ* appellant, cognitionem Dei nobis, circumcisa et ablata notarum rerum cognitione, supponet: “Deus est neque corpus neque ullum elementum neque anima neque mens neque sensus neque intellectus neque aliquid quod ex his capi potest.” His talibus sublatiis quid sit Deus potest definiri; magis si addas, quod etiam definiri non potest, id Deum esse.

279 Op. cit. I, 6, ll. 45–47 (in Ippolito, 42).

280 See, e.g., Ernest Gottlieb Sihler, “III – Θετικώτερον. Cicero *Ad Quintum Fratrem* III 3,4,” *American Journal of Philology* 23, 3 (1902): 283–94, at 288–92; Jaap Mansfeld and David T. Runia, *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, II, *The Compendium*, part 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 203–204. Cf. Ian Gray Kidd, *Posidonius*, II, *The Commentary*, (i) *Testimonia and Fragments 1–149* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 196.

281 Anne-Isabelle Bouton-Touboul, “Deux interprétations du scepticisme: Marius Victorinus et Augustin,” *Les Études philosophiques* 101, 2 (2012): 217–32, at 232.

Since we can in no way know what God is, if we remove all beings (which Greeks call ὄντα), we will be provided with knowledge of God, by cutting off and abstracting the knowledge of all the beings we know: “God is neither body nor any element nor soul nor mind nor understanding nor intellect nor anything we can grasp on the basis of them.” By removing such things, it is possible to define God – even more, if you add: “what cannot be defined, this is God.”²⁸²

These lines are strikingly similar to the celebrated apophatic description of God that Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (fl. ca. 500 AD) placed in the concluding chapter of *De mystica theologia*:

... Οὐτε ψυχὴ ἐστὶν οὔτε νοῦς, οὔτε φαντασίαν ἢ δόξαν ἢ λόγον ἢ νόησιν ἔχει· οὐδὲ λόγος ἐστὶν οὔτε νόησις, οὔτε λέγεται οὔτε νοεῖται... οὔτε ἐστὶν... ἄλλο τι τῶν ἡμῖν... συνεγνωσμένων.

It is neither soul nor intellect, nor has it imagination, opinion, reason or understanding; nor can it be expressed or conceived... nor is it... anything else known to us...²⁸³

Presumably, both Victorinus and Pseudo-Dionysius reflect some Middle Platonic²⁸⁴ and/or Neoplatonic²⁸⁵ apophatic line of theology, which goes back to Plato's celebrated *Parmenides* 142A3–4.²⁸⁶ This line of theology testifies to a point that the converted Victorinus regarded as shared by Platonism and Christianity, a point that could be expressed equally well in both apophatic and ‘Sceptical’ terms, granted that “dans le système néoplatonicien, le proba-

282 Marius Victorinus, *Liber de definitionibus* 24, 18–25 (ed. Hadot, *Marius*, 354). This oxymoron (grasping something by means of avoiding defining it) is not far from the ‘sentiment océanique’ in the Platonic traditions both heathen and Christian: see Jean-Marie Mathieu, “Sentiment océanique chez Platon et dans le platonisme chrétien,” *Kentron* 16, 1–2 (2000): 9–39.

283 Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite, *De mystica theologia* v (ed. Günter Heil and Adolf Martin Ritter, *Corpus dionysiacum*, 11, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De caelesti hierarchia. De ecclesiastica hierarchia. De mystica theologia. Epistulae* [PTS 36; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991], 149, 1–3; 150, 1); tr. John D. Jones, *Pseudo-Dionysius. The Divine Names and Mystical Theology* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1980), 209.

284 See Lilla, “La teologia negativa,” 264–73.

285 Cf. Plotinus's *Enneads* vi, 9, 3, 36–45 (noted in Heil and Ritter, *Corpus dionysiacum*, 11, app. font., ad 149, 1–3). See Lilla, “La teologia negativa,” 251–53; 263–64.

286 See the passages collected in Lilla, “La teologia negativa (*supra*, 296, n. 180), *passim*.

bilisme académique [inasmuch as it abstains itself from making strong assertions] peut [...] trouver sa place, au plan de l'existence humaine."²⁸⁷

6 Gregory Nazianzen

6.1 Scepticism in the Service of Fideism

As I have shown elsewhere, the famous *Orations XXVIII* and *XXIX* (*Theological Orations II* and *III*) that Gregory Nazianzen (329/330–390 AD) composed in 380 AD²⁸⁸ contain material deriving directly (with only insignificant modifications) from dilemmatic arguments expounded in various passages from Sextus Empiricus's *Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes* III and *Adversus Mathematicos* VIII–X (= *Adversus Logicos* II and *Adversus Physicos* I–II). Gregory used Sextus in roughly the same way that Philo of Alexandria had used Aenesidemus four centuries earlier. That is, Gregory attempted to degrade the human cognitive faculties (senses, representation or 'phantasia', and reasoning) and logical tools (categories, propositions, and syllogisms) in order to show by means of an *a fortiori* argument that, if ordinary things lie beyond the reach of our knowledge, then divine things do so even more. Divine things can therefore be known only in part and only through revelation, as interpreted by Church and grasped by Christians through faith. This line of argument formed part of Gregory's polemics against the allegedly self-confident, even arrogant theological 'rationalism' of Eunomius of Cyzicus (*paulo post* 330–ca. 394/5 AD).²⁸⁹

²⁸⁷ Hadot, *Marius*, 51; 58.

²⁸⁸ See Gallay and Jourjon, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours* 27–31, 13–14.

²⁸⁹ Demetracopoulos, *Νικόλαου Καβάσιλα*, 130–47; id., "Gregory Nazianzen: Sceptic" (cf. *supra*, 304, n. 205), 121–122. So, Scepticism must be included among the ancient philosophical schools with which Gregory was acquainted. On Platonism, Aristotelianism, Neoplatonism, Stoicism, and Cynicism in Gregory's thought, see, e.g., Claudio Moreschini, "Il platonismo cristiano di Gregorio Nazianzeno," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Lettere e Filosofia* III, 4, 4 (1974): 1347–92, at 1347–52; Beatrice Wyss, "Gregor II (Gregor von Nazianz)," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 12 (1983): 793–863, at 821–35; John A. McGuckin, *St Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography* (New York: St. Vladimir's, 2001), 57–58; Brian E. Daley, *Gregory of Nazianzus* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 34–35; Anne Richard, *Cosmologie et théologie chez Grégoire de Nazianze* (Paris: Institut d'études augustinienes, 2003), 126–63; 315–25; *passim*. What Gregory's assimilation of various elements from these schools is praised for, namely, its 'synthetic ingenuity' (McGuckin, *St Gregory*, 58), must be checked in the light of a fuller picture of the material assimilated. For instance, to focus on Scepticism, both the purely philosophical combination of Platonism with Scepticism and the application of this combination to theological matters were already available in Philo of Alexandria's writings, which Gregory knew. In general, what appears to be a synthesis formulated by Gregory himself may instead be

Gregory seems to imitate the Sceptics' cure of those who suffer from the disease of arrogance, i.e. the Dogmatics, who think they can reach truth, as described by Sextus Empiricus in the concluding Chapter of his *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*:

‘Ο Σκεπτικός διὰ τὸ φιλάνθρωπος εἶναι τὴν τῶν δογματικῶν οἴησίν τε καὶ προπέτειαν {1} κατὰ δύναμιν ἰᾶσθαι λόγῳ [2] βούλεται. Καθάπερ οὖν οἱ τῶν σωματικῶν παθῶν [3] ἰατροὶ διάφορα κατὰ μέγεθος ἔχουσι βοηθήματα, καὶ τοῖς μὲν σφοδρῶς πεπονθόσι [3] τὰ σφοδρὰ τούτων προσάγουσι, τοῖς δὲ κούφως τὰ κουφότερα, καὶ ὁ Σκεπτικός οὕτως διαφόρους ἔρωτᾷ κατὰ ἰσχὺν λόγους [2], καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἐμβριθέσι καὶ εὐτόνως ἀνασκευάζειν δυνάμενοις τὸ τῆς οἴησεως {1} τῶν Δογματικῶν πάθος [3] ἐπὶ τῶν σφοδρᾷ τῇ προπετείᾳ {1} κεκακωμένων {3} χρήται, τοῖς δὲ κουφοτέροις ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπιπόλαιον καὶ εὐίαιτον ἐχόντων τὸ τῆς οἴησεως {1} πάθος [3] καὶ ὑπὸ κουφοτέρων πιθανότητων ἀνασκευάζεσθαι δυνάμενον. Διόπερ ὅτε μὲν ἐμβριθεῖς ταῖς πιθανότησιν, ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀμαυροτέρους φαινομένους οὐκ ὀκνεῖ λόγους [2] συνερωτᾶν²⁹⁰ ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς Σκέψεως ὁρμώμενος, ἐπίτηδες {4}, ὡς ἀρκούντας αὐτῷ πολλάκις πρὸς τὸ ἀνύειν τὸ προκείμενον.

The Sceptic, being a lover of his kind, desires to cure by speech, as best he can, the self-conceit and rashness of the Dogmatists. So, just as the physicians who cure bodily ailments have remedies which differ in strength, and apply the severe ones to those whose ailments are severe and the milder to those mildly affected, so too the Sceptic propounds arguments which differ in strength, and employs those which are weighty and capable by their stringency of disposing of the Dogmatists' ailment, self-conceit, in cases where the mischief is due to a severe attack of rashness, while he employs the milder arguments in the case of those whose ailment of conceit is superficial and easy to cure, and whom it is possible to restore to health by milder methods of persuasion. Hence the adherent of Sceptic principles does not scruple to propound at one time

just an adoption of a combination that had already taken place in the eclectic philosophical thought as it developed from the 2nd–1st century BC to Gregory's days.

290 “ἔρωτᾷ”, “συνερωτᾶν”: paragraphs 7–10 of Gregory's *Oration XXVIII* consist exclusively of a long list of successive (‘...προσεξετάσωμεν...’) dilemmatic questions. On this *modo Sceptico*, which is extremely hard to resolve, André-Jean Voelke, “L'incommunicabilité du savoir dans le scepticisme grec,” in *Zetesis. Album amicorum door vrienden en collega's aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. E. de Strycker* (Antwerpen and Utrecht: De Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 1973), 177–87, at 177, identifies the source of the difficulty: “...réfuter plusieurs thèses successives en concédant à chaque nouvelle étape la thèse précédemment réfutée...”

arguments that are weighty in their persuasiveness, and at another time such as appear less impressive, and he does so on purpose, as the latter are frequently sufficient to enable him to effect his object.²⁹¹

Gregory, for his own part, epiloguing his latent reproduction of some of Sextus's arguments for and against the existence and nature of the divine, says:

Τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν {4} ταῦτα διήλθον καὶ περιεργότερον ἴσως ἢ κατὰ τὰς τῶν πολλῶν ἀκοὰς καὶ κατὰ τὸν νῦν κεκρατηκότα τύπον τῶν λόγων [2], ὃς τὸ γενναῖον καὶ ἀπλοῦν ἀτιμάσας τὸ σκολιὸν καὶ γριφοειδὲς ἐπεισήγαγεν . . . ; "Ἴν' ἐκεῖνο δηλώσαιμι, ὃ μοι λέγειν ὁ λόγος [2] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὥρμησε. Τοῦτο δὲ ἦν τί; Τὸ μὴ ληπτὸν εἶναι ἀνθρωπίνῃ διανοίᾳ τὸ θεῖον . . . καὶ τοῦτο . . . ὥς {4} μὴ ταυτὸν ἡμᾶς τῷ Ἐωσφόρῳ πάσχειν [3] . . . , πίπτειν ἐκ τῆς ἐπάρσεως {1} . . .

Why have I made this digression, too labored, I dare say, for the general ear but in tune with the prevalent fashion in sermons, a fashion which despises noble simplicity and substitutes tortuous conundrums? I wanted to make plain the point my sermon began with, which was this: the incomprehensibility of deity to the human mind . . . And this is so . . . as to save us from sharing Lucifer's fate of falling out of pride . . .²⁹²

Both Sextus and Gregory say that they intend to cure some who hold firm beliefs from the disease of arrogance or excessive self-confidence and that, to achieve this, they use arguments whose validity do not necessarily accept themselves yet which are effective enough to shake their addressees' unfounded certainty. Gregory describes his addressees in a way Sextus would find excellent to describe Dogmatic professors:

291 Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 111, 280–1 (Mau, *Sexti*, 1, 208); tr. Bury, *Sextus*, 1, 511–13. On the exact meaning of 'weighty' and 'mild arguments' in this passage, see Diego E. Machuca, "The Pyrrhonist's ἀταραξία and φιλανθρωπία," *Ancient Philosophy* 26 (2006): 111–39, at 129–30; id., "Argumentative Persuasiveness in Ancient Pyrrhonism," *Méthexis* 22 (2009): 1–27. According to Gregory's reception of this passage, the Sceptic uses arguments regardless of their alleged or real, cognisable or not, validity, only depending on the expected effectiveness ("ἰσχύς") of each of them. For instance, Gregory explicitly rejects this way of discussing the theological issues and qualifies that he did so only to show the absurdity of trusting one's own reasoning.

292 Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration XXVIII* 11, 1–12; 12, 11–14 (Gallay and Jourjon, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours* 27–31, 122; 124); Frederick Norris, Lionel Wickham, and Frederick Williams, *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning. The Five Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 230 (modified).

οἱ πάντα εἰδέναι τε καὶ διδάσκειν ὑπισχνεῖσθε²⁹³ λίαν νεανικῶς καὶ γενναίως, ἵνα μὴ λυπῶ λέγων ἀμαθῶς καὶ θρασέως.

... Since you profess to know all and teach all – an attitude which is too naive and pretentious: I would not offend you by saying stupid and arrogant.²⁹⁴

Gregory, in an oration that dates from roughly the same time (early 379 AD), directly links the ineffectiveness of human reason – which he describes in terms of the Sceptical maxim παντὶ λόγῳ λόγος ἀντίκειται (see *supra*, 315, n. 235)²⁹⁵ – with the need for faith:

Φύσει μὲν ἅπας λόγος σαθρὸς καὶ εὐκίνητος καὶ διὰ τὸν ἀντίμαχον λόγον ἐλευθερίαν οὐκ ἔχων. Ὁ δὲ περὶ Θεοῦ τοσοῦτῳ μᾶλλον, ὅσῳ μείζον τὸ ὑποκείμενον καὶ ὁ ζῆλος πλείων καὶ ὁ κίνδυνος χαλεπώτερος. Καὶ τί φοβηθέντες θαρρήσομεν, νοῦν ἢ λόγον ἢ ἀκοήν, ἐν τρισὶ τούτοις κινδύνου σαλεύοντος; Καὶ γὰρ νοῆσαι χαλεπὸν καὶ ἐρμηνεύσαι ἀμήχανον καὶ ἀκοῆς κεκαθαρμένης τυχεῖν ἐργωδέστερον.

Every doctrine is by its very nature lame and unstable and has restricted power because of its opposing doctrine. Now the doctrine of God is even more so because its subject matter is higher, our zeal stronger and the danger of failure higher. Which of these kinds of fear can we confidently cope with? The one inherent in mind, speech, or hearing – granted that it is in these three things that danger emerges. Indeed, it is hard to grasp God, impossible to express what we have grasped, and even more difficult to find an addressee whose hearing is pure enough to understand what he is told.²⁹⁶

293 Cf. Sextus's description of how the Sirens' promise all knowledge to travelers (Demetracopoulos, "Gregory Nazianzen: Sceptic," 129, n. 28).

294 Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration xxvii* 2, 29–31 (Gallay and Jourjon, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours* 27–31, 74); tr. Wickham and Williams, *Faith Gives Fullness*, 218.

295 This maxim was verbatim assimilated by Gregory Nazianzen (see Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 170, n. 117).

296 Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio xxxii* 14, 14–17 (ed. Claudio Moreschini, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours* 32–37 [SC 318; Paris: Cerf, 1985], 114). On the date of *Oration xxxii* see Moreschini, *op. cit.*, 10–11; Francesco Trisoglio, *Gregorio di Nazianzo il teologo* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1996), 159.

In this passage, Gregory, by means of the Sceptical maxim that every proposition can be counter-argued on equal terms, depicts how difficult it is for a spiritual leader to grasp the truth about anything, particularly about the divine things, by implicitly yet visibly paraphrasing the famous Platonic passage from *Timaeus* (28C3–5) on the inherent difficulty faced by one's efforts to conceive of God, express one's conception of Him by words, and communicate this conception to others. Thus Scepticism and Platonism, in admirable harmony, serve Christian apophaticism.

Gregory Nazianzen casts doubt on human reasoning in his poems, too:

Πολλοὺς ὁρῶν γράφοντας “ἐν τῷ νῦν βίω” (Plato, *Phaedo* 85C3) λόγους ἀμέτρους καὶ ῥέοντας εὐκόλως καὶ πλείστον ἐκτρίβοντας ἐν πόνοις χρόνον, ὧν κέρδος οὐδὲν ἢ κενὴ γλωσσαλγία... , πάντων μὲν ἂν ἥδιστα καὶ γνώμην μίαν ταύτην ἔδωκα, πάντα ῥίψαντας λόγον αὐτῶν ἔχεσθαι τῶν θεοπνεύστων μόνον, ὡς τοὺς ζᾶλιν φεύγοντας ὄρμων εὐδίω. [...] Πότ’ ἂν γράφων σὺ τοῖς κάτω νοήμασιν ἀναμφιλέκτους, ὧ τάν, ἐκτείναις λόγους; Ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦτο παντελῶς ἀμήχανον [cf. Plato, *Phaedo* 85C3 and 8: “... ἀδύνατον... ”], κόσμου ῥαγέντος εἰς τόσας διαστάσεις, πάντων τ’ ἔρεισμα τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἐκτροπῆς τούτους ἐχόντων τοὺς λόγους συμπροστάτας, ἄλλην μετῆλθον τῶν λόγων ταύτην ὁδὸν...

Seeing many people “in this present age” writing treatises without measure which flow forth easily, and expending a great deal of time on their efforts for which no reward awaits – or only empty chatter..., I gave them wholeheartedly this single piece of advice: throwing away every prose piece, they should cling only to the divinely inspired ones, as those who flee the storm seek harbour’s calm. [...] When you write, do you, my friend, bring indisputable arguments to your thoughts that belong to this lower world? Since this is completely impossible, now the world has broken up into so many separate parts and everyone has supporting arguments like these as a basis for their own direction, I have taken another path in my writing, and this is it...²⁹⁷

Gregory’s intention is to justify his preference for poetry over prose as a form of literary expression. Playing with the various meanings of λόγος/-οι (‘prose’

297 Gregory Nazianzen, *Carmina* II, 1, 39 (*In suos versus*), vv. 1–21 (ed. Carolinne White, *Gregory of Nazianzus. Autobiographical Poems* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996], 2–3 = PG 37, 1330A–1331A); translation partly revised. I deliberately do not reproduce the metrical form of the passage, in order to help the reader focus on its content.

and ‘arguments’) and μέτρον (‘rhythm’ and ‘measure’),²⁹⁸ he tries to establish this superiority by showing the inferiority of prose. The strong point of prose, especially of treatises and orations, is that the author has the opportunity to lay out his arguments fully and convincingly. Now, it is exactly the pagan sages’ ambition to support their views by means of λόγων ἀνάγκαι ἀναμφιλέκτων that Gregory is mocking. To him, there is no such thing as ἀναμφιλέκτος λόγος; this is just a restatement of his beloved Sceptical maxim παντὶ λόγῳ λόγος ἀντίκειται (see *supra*, 315). In fact, Gregory objects, everybody uses the λόγοι as an ally for his own idiosyncratic beliefs: *quot capita, tot sensus*! This is exactly the Sceptical argument from wishful thinking produced earlier by Sextus Empiricus and Pseudo-Clement of Rome, and directed against the holding of any Dogmatic doctrine (see *supra*, 311). From Gregory’s point of view, to devote oneself to the intellectual and literary activity of λόγοι (πλείστον [1] ἐκτρίβοντας [2] ἐν πόνοις [3] χρόνον [4], ὧν κέρδος οὐδέν [5] . . .) is only to continue into adulthood the absurd waste of one’s youth in the disciplined acquisition of such a useless skill, as Basil describes (πολὺν [1] χρόνον [4] προσαναλώσας [2] τῇ ματαιότητι [5] . . . τῇ ματαιοπονίᾳ [5] ἣν εἶχον προσδιατρίβων [2] . . . τὸ ἄχρηστον [5] τῆς σοφίας . . .; see *supra*, 315, note 236). I can hardly resist the temptation to note the parallels between Gregory’s λόγων ἀνάγκαι ἀναμφιλέκτων and Plato’s ὁ βέλτιστος τῶν ἀνθρώπων λόγων καὶ δυσεξελεγκτότατος (*Phaedo* 85C8–9; cf. *supra*, 263), and between Gregory’s μάχη κρατήσαντες and Plato’s description of the “dialectician” as ὥσπερ ἐν μάχῃ διὰ πάντων ἐλέγχων διεξιῶν, μὴ κατὰ δόξαν ἀλλὰ κατ’ οὐσίαν προθυμούμενος ἐλέγχειν, ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις ἀπῴτῳ τῷ λόγῳ διαπορεύεται in his re-elaboration of the *Phaedo* passage in the *Republic* (534C1–3; cf. *supra*, 263). Gregory glaringly opts for the Sceptical rejection of Plato’s epistemological optimism. He suggests that contemporary intellectuals throw away all heathen treatises (since those writings fail to establish their truths by means of their allegedly effective, yet in fact just excessively long arguments) and keep only the Holy Scripture. Once more, Gregory uses Scepticism so as to substitute faith for philosophy.

6.2 Gregory Nazianzen’s Reception of Xenophanes’s B34

Gregory Nazianzen applies his Sceptically-coloured view about the radical inefficacy of human reason to the specific problem of the divine nature. In §17 of *Oration xxviii* (2nd *Theological Oration*), which is the first of the two ora-

298 Čelica Milovanovic-Barham, “Gregory of Nazianzus: *Ars Poetica* (*In suos versus: Carmen* 2.1.39,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5 (1997): 497–510, at 501; Carmelo Crimi, *Gregorio Nazianzeno. Poesie*, II (Rome: Città nuova, 1999), 154, n. 1.

tions enriched with material drawn from Sextus Empiricus (see *supra*, 331), one reads a passage often quoted as emblematic of Greek patristic apophaticism:²⁹⁹

Θεόν, [1], ὅ,τι ποτε μέν ἐστι τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν, οὕτε [2] τις [3] εὗρεν {4} ἀνθρώπων [4] πώποτε, οὕτε {6} μὴ εὗρη {7}. Ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν εὗρήσει ποτέ, ζητεῖσθω τοῦτο καὶ φιλοσοφείσθω παρὰ τῶν βουλομένων.³⁰⁰ Εὗρήσει δέ, ὡς ἐμός λόγος, ἐπειδὴν τὸ “θεοειδές” τοῦτο καὶ θεῖον (cf. Gen. 1:26), λέγω δὲ τὸν ἡμέτερον νοῦν τε καὶ “λόγον”,³⁰¹ τῷ οἰκείῳ προσμίξει καὶ ἡ “εἰκὼν” (Gen. 1:26) ἀνέλθῃ πρὸς “τὸ ἀρχέτυπον”,³⁰² οὗ νῦν ἔχει τὴν ἔφεσιν.³⁰³ Καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ τὸ πᾶν φιλοσοφούμενον, “ἐπιγνώσεσθαι ποτε ἡμᾶς, ὅσον ἐγνώσμεθα” (1 Cor. 13:12). Τὸ δὲ νῦν εἶναι βραχεῖά τις ἀπορροή πᾶν τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάνον, καὶ οἶον μεγάλου “φωτός” μικρὸν “ἀπαύγασμα” (Sap. 7:26). “Ὡστε καὶ εἴ τις [3/8] “ἐγνώ” {4} Θεόν [1] ἢ “ἐγνώκεναι” (Ps. 55:10; Joh. 14:7; 1 Cor. 8:2) μεμαρτύρηται, τοσοῦτον ἔγνων, ὅσον ἄλλου μὴ τὸ ἴσον ἐλλαμφθέντος φανῆναι φωτοειδέστερος. Καὶ τὸ

299 See, e.g., Jean-Claude Larchet, *La théologie des énergies divines. Des origines à saint Jean Damascène* (Paris: Cerf, 2010), 164.

300 Cf. Philo of Alexandria, *Legum allegoriae* III, 47: “Εἰ γὰρ ζητεῖς Θεόν, ὦ διάνοια [...], εἰ [...] ζητοῦσα εὗρήσεις Θεόν, ἄδηλον” (Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis* I, 123, 13–16).

301 On the whole period, cf. Philo of Alexandria, *De specialibus legibus* III, 207: “Θεοειδῆς (cf. Plato, *Phaedo* 95C5) ὁ ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς, πρὸς ἀρχέτυπον ἰδέαν τὸν ἀνωτάτω λόγον τυπωθεὶς” (Leopold Cohn, *Philonis* V, 207, 17–18); *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat*, 84: “Τὸ θεοειδές ἐκεῖνο δημιούργημα, ὃ λογιζόμεθα” (cf. Plato, *Philebus* 11D–12A; *Leges* 896E–897A; Cohn, *Philonis* I, 277, 14). Cf. Francesco Trisoglio, “Filone Alessandrino e l’esegesi cristiana: contributo alla conoscenza dell’influsso esercitato da Filone sul IV secolo, specificamente in Gregorio di Nazianzo,” in Wolfgang Haase, ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II, 21, 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 588–730, at 609–10.

302 See Plotinus, *Enneads* V, 3, 8, 46–55: “Ἀνάγεσθαι καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν εἰς αὐτὸ εἰκόνα θεμένην ἑαυτὴν εἶναι ἐκείνου, ὡς τὴν αὐτῆς ζωὴν ἵνδαλμα καὶ ὁμοίωμα εἶναι ἐκείνου, καὶ ὅταν νοῆ, θεοειδῆ καὶ νοοειδῆ γίγνεσθαι... Δι’ αὐτῆς εἰκόνης οὔσης ὁρᾶν δύνασθαι ἀμηγέπη ἐκείνον, διὰ τῆς ἐκείνω πρὸς τὸ ἀκριβέστερον ὁμοιωμένης, ὅσον ψυχῆς μέρος εἰς ὁμοιότητα νῶ δύναται ἐλθεῖν”; IV, 7, 10, 13–19: “Εἰ οὖν τοιοῦτον ἡ ψυχὴ, ὅταν ἐφ’ ἑαυτὴν ἀνέλθῃ, πῶς οὐ τῆς φύσεως ἐκείνης, οἶαν φαμέν τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ [...] εἶναι;... Ἀνάγκη τὸ τοιοῦτον θεῖον [...] εἶναι, ἅτε θεῖων μετὸν αὐτῷ διὰ συγγένειαν καὶ τὸ ὁμοοῦσιον”; V, 1, 4, 5–6: “... ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρχέτυπον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ἀληθινώτερον ἀναβάς...” (ed. Paul Henry and Hans-Rudolf Schwytzer, *Plotini Opera*, II [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977], 218; 159; 190).

303 Cf. Philo of Alexandria, *Quaestiones in “Exodum,”* unidentified fr. 3: “Ἀμήχανον ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν τὸ τοῦ ὄντος ὄντος πρόσωπον θεάσασθαι. [...] Τὸ δὲ αἶτιον ἡ ἀδυναμία τοῦ γενητοῦ. [...] Θεὸν γενέσθαι δεῖ πρότερον (ὅπερ οὐδὲ οἶόν τε), ἵνα Θεὸν ἰσχύσῃ τις καταλαβεῖν. Ἐάν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ μὲν τις τὸν θνητὸν βίον, ζῆσθαι δὲ ἀντιλαβὼν τὸν θάνατον, ἴσως δὲ μηδέποτε εἶδεν ὄψεται” (Petit, *Les œuvres*, 282–83).

ὑπερβάλλον {9} τέλειον ἐνομίσθη οὐ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ {1}, τῇ δὲ τοῦ πλησίον δυνάμει παραμετρούμενον.

No man has yet discovered or shall ever discover (in the foreseeable future) what God is in His nature or essence. In any case, whether it will be discovered some time in the (indeterminate) future or not, let it be searched [into] and speculated [about] by those who have a mind to [do] it. What I think is that the discovery will take place when this “God-like,” divine thing, I mean our mind and reason, mingles with its kin, when the copy returns to the pattern it now longs after. This seems to me to be the meaning of the much-scrutinized dictum that “we shall”, in time to come, “know even as we are known”. But for the present all that reaches us is nothing more than a scant emanation, as it were a small “beam” from a great “light” – which means that even if someone did “know” God or, better, [if] his knowledge of God has been attested (in the Bible), he has achieved such knowledge only to such a degree that comparatively shows him to partake of light more than others not equally illuminated. This superiority was reckoned to be knowledge in the full sense, not because it really was so, but only in comparison to the power of his co-humans.³⁰⁴

As far as I know, the sources of this passage have never been explored. The passage’s first period looks like a succinct, carefully elaborated mixture of 1 Tim. 6:16 (ὃν [sc. God] εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύνανται³⁰⁵ / “Whom no human

304 Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio xxviii*, par. 17 *in toto* (ed. Gallay and Jourjon, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27–31*, 134–36); tr. Wickham and Williams, *Faith Gives Fullness*, 233–34 (slightly modified).

305 This passage, whose point occurs in some other Scriptural passages (1 Tim. 1:17; Joh. 6:46; 1 Joh. 4:20), can be fully reduced to Ex. 33:20 (“Οὐ δυνήσῃ ἰδεῖν μου τὸ πρόσωπον· οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἴδῃ ἄνθρωπος τὸ πρόσωπόν μου καὶ ζήσεται”) and Joh. 1:18 (“Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε”; see Philip H. Towner, *The New International Commentary on the New Testament. The Letters to Timothy and Titus* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 2006), 422, n. 67; see also *op. cit.*, 42: “Clearly from the standpoint of ontology, the God of the covenant is as unlike human claimants to divine glory and honor as can possibly be. Old Testament imagery and concepts combine to spell out the sheer distance that, both in terms of power and character of existence, separates human creation from the eternal God”. 1 Tim. 6:16 is also seen as Old-Testamentarian in origins by Tajalli wa-Ru’ya, “A Study of Anthropomorphic Theophany and Visio Dei in the Hebrew Bible, the Qur’an and Early Sunnī Islam” (Doct. diss., University of Michigan, 2008), 21–75. Still, one cannot exclude the possibility that this radical rejection of the possibility that man might see God resulted from some influence from the doctrine of the natural invisibility of God that is found in some Hellenistic

being has seen or is able to see”) with vv. 1–2 of Xenophanes’s B34. Besides the close verbal similarities, Gregory’s reference to the impossibility of knowledge of God’s φύσις and οὐσία is equivalent to Xenophanes’s denying humans the ability of getting knowledge of τὸ σαφές (v. 1) as far as the divine things are concerned. Granted that Gregory had (earlier as well as later in the same work, as well as in the *3rd Theological Oration*) used material from Sextus’s *Adversus Mathematicos* VI and VIII–X (cf. *supra*, 331, n. 289), it is quite plausible that Xenophanes’s passage had not passed unnoticed by him; besides, Sextus had highlighted B34 by means of some *ad hoc* interpretive comments.³⁰⁶ Further, as has been pointed out,³⁰⁷ Gregory tacitly refers to Xenophanes’s natural

philosophies: see Rudolf Bultmann, “Untersuchungen zum Johannesevangelium,” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft* 27 (1928): 113–63; 29 (1930): 169–92, at 177–78 and 187–88 = id., *Exegetica. Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen 1967), 124–97, at 177–82 and 192–93; Andrew S. Malone, “The Invisibility of God: A Survey of a Misunderstood Phenomenon,” *Evangelical Quarterly* 79, 4 (2007): 311–29. On the similarity between the Xenophanean and the Old Testament (e.g., Deut. 4:12–17) idea of the radical difference between God and man, an idea that implies that “the *via negativa* is the only rationally justifiable way of talking about the deity,” see, e.g., Heitsch, “Das Wissen,” 223; Otto Kaiser, “Der eine Gott und die Goetter der Welt,” in id., *Zwischen Athen und Jerusalem. Studien zur griechischen und biblischen Theologie, ihrer Eigenart und ihrem Verhältnis* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 135–52, at 147–48; Ernese Mogyoródi, “Xenophanes as a Philosopher: Theology and Theodicy,” in *Qu’est-ce que la philosophie présocratique? / What Is Presocratic Philosophy?* André Laks and Claire Louguet, ed. (Villeneuve d’Ascq [Nord]: Presses Universitaires de Septentrion, 2002), 253–86, at 263.

306 Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* VII, 50–52; 110 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 13; 25). Cf. *supra*, 288. A passage verbally close to that from Gregory is Pseudo-Justin’s *Epistula ad Diognetum* 8 in Johann Carl Theodor Otto, ed., *Epistola ad Diognetum Justinii philosophi et martyris nomen prae se ferens. Editio secunda* (Leipzig: Weigel, 1852), 72: “Τίς γὰρ ὅλως ἀνθρώπων ἠπίστατο, τί ποτ’ ἔστι Θεός, πρὶν αὐτὸν ἐλθεῖν; [. . .] Ἀνθρώπων δὲ οὐδεὶς οὔτε εἶδεν οὔτε ἐγνώρισεν· αὐτὸς δὲ ἑαυτὸν ἐπέδειξεν”. Yet, the similarity is only superficial; for, contrary to Gregory, Pseudo-Justin says that men did acquire knowledge of ‘what God is’ after His own self-manifestation on earth.

307 See Messina, *Dalla fisica*, 56–57. Compare Gregory Nazianzen’s *Oration* IV, 116, 7–9 (ed. Jean Bernardi, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 4–5: Contre Julien* [SC 309; Paris: Cerf, 1983], 276–78) to Xenophanes’s A50 and B33 (ed. Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, I, 121; 126, 13; 136, 17). Messina (op. cit., 57, n. 11) plausibly regards Gregory’s lines as a new *testimonium*. Gregory repudiates this natural doctrine of Xenophanes (along with all the pagan – mythical and philosophical – explanations of reality) as ‘absurd’ (op. cit. 116, 10, in Bernardi, op. cit., 278). This matches Gregory’s major Sceptical point (see *supra*, 331) that man is unable to give an account of the natural world, which is, in a certain sense, Xenophanes’s point, too.

doctrine that everything is a compound of the elements of 'earth' and 'water,' which means that he had some knowledge of some of Xenophanes's doctrines.

This is not the only time Gregory assimilated some emblematic Sceptical lines. In his *Carmina* 1.2 X, l. 977 and XXXIII, l. 12,³⁰⁸ Gregory positively reproduced one of the Sceptical φωναί (maxims) listed by Sextus, namely, παντὶ λόγῳ λόγος ἴσος ἀντίκειται" ("To every argument there is an equally strong counter-argument").³⁰⁹

Moreover, Gregory's τὴν φύσιν and οὐ [...] εὗρεν [...] οὔτε μὴ εὗρη have their correspondent in Philo's unacknowledged reproduction of Xenophanes's fragment (τὴν [...] φύσιν ἰδεῖν; τὸ σαφὲς εὗρεῖν; *supra*, 292). So, it would not be unreasonable to think that Gregory's appropriation of B34 was inspired by Philo of Alexandria.³¹⁰ Further, Gregory's construal of Xenophanes's 'piety' as

308 "Λόγῳ γάρ ἐστι πᾶς λόγος ἀντίστατος"; "Λόγῳ παλαίει πᾶς λόγος" (PG 37: 751A; 929A). Manfred Kertsch, commenting upon the critical text of the former poem, in *Gregorio Nazianzeno. Sulla virtù. Carme giambico* (1, 2, 10), (Pisa: ETS, 1995), 376–77, *ad* v. 977, parallels Gregory's line with Maximus of Tyre's *Dissertationes* XXXIII, 1 (in Trapp, *Maximus Tyrius*, 265, 2–16). The point of Maximus is identical with that of Gregory, and one cannot exclude the possibility that Gregory had in his mind these lines by Maximus (see also the parallel between Gregory's l. 776 and Maximus's *Dissertationes* IV, 5d1–5 and VII, 7d, noted by Kertsch, 376 *ad loc.*; on Maximus's affinity with Scepticism, see *supra*, 299–300). Still, it is even more important that Gregory knew of the Sceptical maxim under discussion from a purely philosophical and, indeed, Sceptical source, i.e., Sextus Empiricus (cf. *supra*, 334).

309 See *supra*, 334, n. 295. On Gregory's direct dependence on Sextus on this point see Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 169–70, n. 116.

310 See, e.g., Philo of Alexandria's *De mutatione nominum* 9–10 (comment on Ex. 33:23): "... Τῶν ὅσα μετὰ τὸ ὄν σωματικῶν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ πραγμάτων εἰς κατὰληψιν ἐρχομένων, εἰ καὶ μὴ πάντα ἤδη καταλαμβάνεται, μόνου δ' ἐκείνου μὴ πεφυκὸς ὁρᾶσθαι. Καὶ τί θαυμαστόν, εἰ τὸ ὄν ἀνθρώποις ἀκατάληπτον, ὅποτε καὶ ὁ ἐν ἐκάστῳ νοῦς ἄγνωστος ἡμῖν; Τίς γὰρ ψυχῆς οὐσίαν εἶδεν [an οἶδεν]; Ἡς ἡ ἀδηλότης μυρίας ἔριδας σοφισταῖς ἐγέννησεν ἐναντίας εἰσηγουμένοις γνώμας ἢ καὶ ὅλοις γένεσιν ἀντιστατούσας" / "All below the Existent, things material and immaterial alike, are available to apprehension, even if they are not all actually apprehended as yet, but He alone by His very nature cannot be seen. And why should we wonder that the Existent cannot be apprehended by men, when not even the mind is unknown to us? For who knows the essential nature of the soul, that mystery which has bred numberless contentions among the sophists who propound opinions contrary to each other or even totally and generically opposed?" (Wendland, *Philonis*, III, 157, 22–158, 6; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, V, 147; see also id., *Legum allegoriae* I, 91, in Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, I, 85, 4–12); *De Cherubim* 113–115, in Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, I, 197, 3–15; *De somniis* I, 30, in Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, III, 211, 9–22; *De specialibus legibus* I, 41, in Cohn, *Philonis*, V, 11, 1–2). As Trisoglio, "Filone Alessandrino," has amply shown, many of Gregory's passages derive directly from Philo; I would not share David T. Runia's

the source of his repudiation of human cognitive abilities is strikingly similar to Philo's praise of confessing one's limited knowledge (see *supra*, 288; 290). This linking of intellectual modesty with piety probably goes back to Plato's implicit integration of B34 in *Phaedo* 85C1–D4 (quoted above, 263), which had probably inspired Basil's mixture of Sextan Scepticism with fideism (*supra*, 315, n. 236). Bear in mind, moreover, that Arius Didymus's *Epitome* (where, as noted above, 294, Xenophanes's B34 is quoted and commented upon in a religious spirit) seems to have been a popular textbook during the 4th century AD (see *supra*, 283, n. 137). Thus, if B34 came to Gregory's attention during his higher studies in Alexandria and Athens, it would have been introduced to him as "pious" in spirit.

Even the potentially troublesome vv. 3–4 of B34 found, somehow, a place in Gregory's reproduction of the Xenophanean fragment. Although these lines can easily be read so as to propound a thorough Scepticism that would leave no room at all for human certainty, Gregory boldly flirted with them. Assessing the knowledge of those rarest of men who are deemed to possess some knowledge of the nature of God, he explains that, in fact, what even those men possess is not truth proper but just something discernibly, yet barely, better than

reservations on that; see op. cit., 256–57; cf. Runia, *Philo and the Church Fathers*, 111, n. 25. Besides, Gregory "si formò per un certo periodo sia in Cesarea di Palestina – dove, stando a Gerolamo, il suo compagno di studi fu Euzoio, il restauratore e il conservatore degli scritti di Filone – sia ad Alessandria" (Runia, *Filone di Alessandria*, 255–56; on Euzoios see Cohn, *Philonis*, I, iii–iv; xxxvii). As we have seen (above, 294–295), Plutarch, in *De sera numinis vindicta*, vindicates the justice of Providence against complaints about its incomprehensibility by an *a fortiori* argument from humans' ignorance of the reasons of their own acts. Gregory Nazianzen deployed a similar but slightly different argument (arguing from the humans' ignorance of the ways of nature for the incomprehensibility of the divine nature), in *Oratio xxviii* and *xxix*; so did Gregory of Nyssa in his *Contra Eunomium* 11, 72–78, 106–107 and 113 (in Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, I, *Contra Eunomium I–II* [Leiden: Brill, 1960], 248, 4–250, 2, 257, 28–258, 4 and 259, 16–25; cf. Stuart G. Hall's translation in Lenka Karfíková, Scot Douglass, Johannes Zachhuber, ed., *Proceedings of the 10th International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa: "Gregory of Nyssa, Contra Eunomium II: Philosophy and Theology of Language"* [Supplements to "Vigiliae Christianae" 82; Leiden: Brill, 2006], 75–77). Gregory of Nyssa ("... Τίς γάρ ἔστιν ὃς τῆς ἰδίας ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῆς ἐν καταλήψει γεγένηται, τίς ὁ ἐπιγνοὺς αὐτῆς τὴν οὐσίαν;" etc.) relies directly on Philo's passage previously quoted in this footnote. Likewise, Gregory Nazianzen's *Oratio xxviii* 22 reproduces the same argument based on the same example ("Πῶς ψυχὴ περιγράφεται" etc.; in Gallay and Jourjon, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours* 27–31, 144–48; see also id., *Oratio xxix* 8, op. cit., 190–92). This sort of argument is quite common in Greek Patristic and Byzantine theological literature: see Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 84–108; 133–50.

laymen's knowledge. In other words, even those exceptional men's knowledge of the divine is much closer to ordinary knowledge (bordering, that is, on complete ignorance) than to real knowledge; real knowledge is attainable only in the life to come. This position is not far from Xenophanes's equating practically all men on account of the insufficiency of human knowledge of superior things. Even Xenophanes's τὰ μάλιστα ("in the best case among all men")³¹¹ is echoed in Gregory's statement that even he who has been granted the greatest knowledge among men nonetheless lies at practically the same distance from truth as all humans.³¹²

Of course, the difference in Gregory's position is that, whereas Xenophanes's argument for ignorance claims that even he who happens to utter the truth cannot be sure of his own success, Gregory's stress on human ignorance has a Platonic air: ignorance is the human condition in this life (νῦν; τὸ νῦν εἶναι), from whose obstacles man will be set free in the almost-incorporeal life after death.³¹³ Such a reception of B34 fully aligns with its Middle Platonist reception as attested by Varro, Arius Didymus, and Seneca (see *supra*, 281–286).

6.3 Equating B34 to *Timaeus* 28C3–5

Furthermore, it seems that Gregory viewed Xenophanes's modest declaration that human ignorance is pious in light of an even more famous one from the *Corpus hermeticum*,³¹⁴ a passage Gregory had used earlier in the same *Oration*:

311 Cf. Willem Jacob Verdenius's ("Xenophanes 34,3," *Mnemosyne* 6 [1953], 197) plausible position that τὰ μάλιστα must be taken as an adverbial condense of an implicit subordinate clause, meaning "to put an extreme case," "at best," "the best thing that could happen."

312 See also Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio XXVIII* 3, in Gallay and Jourjon, *Grégoire*, 104–106. On the literary technique of conflating passages and words from authoritative writings during the Greco-Roman era and Late Antiquity see Whittaker, "The Value," 89–91, who shows, among other things, that the technique of conflation "was employed to illustrate the supposed unanimity of Plato with Aristotle, or with any other school of philosophy" (*ibid.*, 90). It is for a similar reason, i.e., because he or his source believed that two or three doctrines (by Xenophanes, Plato and Paul; see next paragraph) coincide, that Gregory Nazianzen used this technique in the passage examined here.

313 Cf. Socrates's words on the clear knowledge to be attained in the future life, in Plato's *Phaedo* (see *supra*, 264) as well as Simmias's words ("... ἐν τῷ νῦν βίῳ...") in the same writing (see *supra*, 263).

314 Pseudo-Hermes Trismegistus, *Ad Tat*; *Corpus Hermeticum*, fr. 1, ll. 1–2 (ed. Arthur Darby Nock, tr. André-Jean Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum*, 111, *Fragments: extraits de Stobée*, 1–22 [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1954], 1; cf. Walter Scott, *Hermetica. The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings Which Contain Religious or Philosophical Teachings Ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus* [Boston: Shambala, 1993; 1925], 380–81). For Gregory's dependence on the

“Θεὸν νοῆσαι μὲν χαλεπὸν, φράσαι δὲ ἀδύνατον”, ὥς τις τῶν παρ’ Ἑλλήσι θεολόγων [sc. Plato in *Timaeus* 28C3–5 *apud* Hermes Trismegistus] ἐφιλοσόφησεν...³¹⁵

“To know God is hard, to describe Him by words is impossible,” as some theologian of the Hellenes has taught.

Many Middle Platonic reproductions of this Platonic passage preserve a version that employs the Platonic verb εὔρεῖν (instead of replacing it with νοῆσαι).³¹⁶ This philological point might explain Gregory’s εὔρεν and μὴ εὔρη in the passage quoted above (337). Still, it remains a fact that Gregory reproduces Xenophanes’s stress on humans’ perpetual inability to discover the truth about the divine, by using a verb in past and a verb in future tense, just as Xenophanes does.³¹⁷

Further, it is not improbable that Gregory had noticed the possible echo of *Timaeus* 28C3–5 in the celebrated Pauline speech in Athens: ζητεῖν τὸν Θεόν, εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφῆσαι αὐτὸν καὶ εὑροῖεν / “in order that they look *for* God, if they could perhaps grope for Him and *find* Him” (Act. 17:27).³¹⁸ Paul’s immediate

corpus Hermeticum as far as this quotation is concerned, see Jean Pépin, “Grégoire de Nazianze lecteur de la littérature hermétique,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1982): 251–60.

315 Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration XXVIII* 4, 1–3 (Gallay and Jourjon, *Grégoire*, 106–108).

316 “Τὸ μὲν δὴ τιμώτατον καὶ μέγιστον ἀγαθὸν οὐτε εὔρεῖν ὤετο εἶναι ῥᾶδιον οὐτε εὐρόντας ἀσφαλὲς εἰς πάντας ἐκφέρειν” (Alcinoos); “Τὸν δὲ πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν πάντων οὐθ’ εὔρεῖν ῥᾶδιον οὐθ’ εὐρόντα εἰς πάντας εἰπεῖν ἀσφαλὲς” (Justin); “Τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντός εὔρεῖν τε ἔργον καὶ εὐρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν” (Origen, who quotes the passage *verbatim*); see Carl Andresen, “Justin und der mittlere Platonismus,” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und Kunde der älteren Kirche* 44 (1952/53): 157–95, which is reproduced in Clemens Zintzen, ed., *Der Mittelplatonismus* (Darmstadt: WBG, 1981), 319–68, at 167–68; Salvatore Lilla, *Introduzione al Medio platonismo* (Rome: Augustinianum, 1992), 41; 111; 118; Paul Hensels, “Einige Bemerkungen zu Origenes’ Auffassungen über die Erkennbarkeit Gottes in ‘De Oratione’ und ‘Contra Celsum’,” *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 44 (2002): 83–102, at 83–84.

317 On using the subjunctive clause of the past tense to denote the possible in the future and, implicitly, the possible *simpliciter* see, e.g., Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmans Griechischer Grammatik*, 11, *Syntax und Syntaktische Stilistik* (Munich: Beck, 1959), 316; Kühner and Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik*, 11, *Satzlehre*, 1, 218, § 394,2; cf. E. Adelaide Hahn, *Subjunctive and Optative. Their Origins and Futures* (New York: American Philological Association, 1953), 80–84, §§ 109–112. On Homer as a pattern for such a use, see, e.g., Ioli, “Senofane B 34 DK,” 202.

318 See Wilfried Eckey, *Die Apostelgeschichte. Der Weg des Evangeliums von Jerusalem nach Rom* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie, 2000), 403, *ad* 27b–c. A previous rich

qualification (καίτοι γε οὐ μακρὰν ἀπὸ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου ἡμῶν ὑπάρχοντα) is glaringly Stoic both in content and in its justification in terms of some of the verses of Aratus's (ca. 315–240 BC) as preserved by the 2nd-century BC Eclectic Jewish apologist Aristobulus³¹⁹ or some similar source.³²⁰ Still, these lines definitely acknowledge a degree of difficulty in the task of discovering God. This is redolent of Middle Platonism, which, as is known, was by then mixed in many aspects with Stoicism.

The chain of passages that I have just set out might have provided Gregory with a plain argument for establishing Scepticism as an ally of faith and using it as an effective weapon against Eunomius's (alleged) 'rationalistic' theological methodology. In fact, it is quite probable that Gregory construed the Xenophanes fragment as a Sceptical version of the fragment from the *corpus Hermeticum* (cited above, 343), which is based on Plato's *Timaeus* 28C3–5. Gregory comments on this famous Platonic dictum as follows:

... οὐκ ἀτέχνως ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, ἵνα καὶ κατελιγμένα δόξη τῷ “χαλεπόν” εἰπεῖν καὶ διαφύγη τῷ “ἀνεκφράστῳ” τὸν ἔλεγχον. Ἀλλὰ ‘φράσαι μὲν’ ‘ἀδύνατον’, ὡς ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος, ‘νοῆσαι δέ’ ἀδυνατώτερον. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ νοηθὲν τάχα ἂν λόγος δηλώσειεν, εἰ καὶ μὴ μετρίως, ἀλλ’ ἀμυδρῶς γε, τῷ μὴ πάντῃ τὰ ὦτα διεφθαρμένῳ καὶ νωθρῷ τὴν διάνοιαν· τὸ δὲ τοσοῦτον πρᾶγμα τῇ διανοίᾳ περιλαβεῖν πάντως ἀδύνατον καὶ ἀμήχανον.

... and it was with subtlety, I think, that he did so, suggesting by the word ‘difficult’ his own apprehension, yet avoiding our test of it by claiming “it was impossible to describe”. No – to tell of God “is not possible,” so my argument runs, but to know him is even less possible. For language may show the content of one's mind if not adequately, at least faintly, to a person not totally deaf and dull of mind; but mentally to grasp so great a matter is utterly beyond real possibility.³²¹

list of philosophical doctrines current in the 1st cent. AD that can be detected in the lines of Paul's speech in Areopagus is that by Enrico Berti, “Il discorso di Paolo agli Ateniesi e la filosofia greca classica,” *Archivio di filosofia* 53, 1 (1985): 251–59.

319 See Mark J. Edwards, “Quoting Aratus: Acts 17:28,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 83, 3–4 (1992): 266–69.

320 See Juhana Torkki, “The Dramatic Account of Paul's Encounter with Philosophy. An Analysis of “Acts” 17:16–34 with Regard to Contemporary Philosophical Debates,” *Doct. diss.*, University of Helsinki, 2004 (<http://ethesis.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/teo/ekseg/vk/torkki/thedrama.pdf>; accessed October 13, 2010), 163–64.

321 Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration XXVIII* 4, 3–10 (Gallay and Jourjon, *Grégoire*, 108); tr. Wickham and Williams, *Faith Gives*, 226.

This radicalisation of *Timaeus* 28C3–5 seems to be an elaborate yet direct borrowing from Philo of Alexandria's assimilation of the Platonic passage:

Δυστόπαστος μὲν οὖν καὶ δυσκατάληπτος ὁ “πατήρ” καὶ ἡγεμὼν τῶν συμπάντων ἐστίν. [...] Τί ἐστι κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν [...] ἰδεῖν οὐ “χαλεπὸν” μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἴσως ἀδύνατον.

Doubtless hard to unriddle and hard to apprehend is the Father and Ruler of all. [...] What the Deity is in essence [...] is not only difficult but perhaps impossible to solve.³²²

In general, this Platonic passage “was in Middle Platonism widely used to stress the evasive character of truth and also [...] to affirm the ineffability of the first principle.”³²³ Thus it seems that on the matter of the incomprehensibility of God in this life, Gregory understood Xenophanes (as implicitly received by Philo of Alexandria), Plato (as received in the *Corpus hermeticum*), and St. Paul to have said the same thing.

7 Theodoret of Cyrus

If I have not yet convinced you that Xenophanes's B34 is implicitly, yet really, present in Gregory Nazianzen, then consider the *Expositio rectae fidei* of Theodoret of Cyrus (393–ca. 466 AD), which formed part of the corpus of Pseudo-Justin (3rd/5th century AD). In the *Expositio*, Theodoret argues for the incomprehensibility of the mystery of the Trinity thus:

Οὐδενὶ οὖν τρόπῳ ἀνθρώποις {4} οὖσιν δυνατόν {a} ἐξικέσθαι [b] τῆς πρώτης ἐκείνης καὶ μακαρίας οὐσίας. Καὶ τί λέγω τῆς θείας [8] οὐσίας! Ἄλλ' οὐδὲ τῶν περὶ αὐτὴν μυστικῶς τελουμένων. “Οὐδέν” γὰρ “ἀνθρώποις” {4} “τῶν θείων” [8] “σαφές” [1], ὡς Ἑλλήνων σοφός τις [sc. Xenophanes] ἐφθέγγετο· ἐγὼ δὲ τὸ λεχθὲν ὡς ἀληθὲς δέχομαι.³²⁴

322 Philo of Alexandria, *De specialibus legibus* 1, 32 (Cohn, *Philonis*, v, 8, 16–22); tr. Colson, *Philo*, vii, 117. Cf. id., *De posteritate Caini* 13: “[...] δυσθηράτου, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνεφίκτου πράγματος ἐρᾷ [...]” / “[...] he is enamoured of an object which entails a hard quest, nay, which is out of reach” (Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, ii, 3, 16–17; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, ii, 335).

323 Henny Fiskå Hägg, *Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 79; see also 155; 257. Cf. *supra*, 294, n. 172.

324 Pseudo-Justin, *Expositio rectae fidei* 8 (ed. Johann Carl Theodor Otto, *Justini martyris Expositio rectae fidei. Corpus apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi*, iv (Jena 1880; repr. Wiesbaden: Martin Sändig, 1969), 28 = col. 379B–C, *juxta* Morel). Cf. Pseudo-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Graecos* viii, 2: “Οὐτε γὰρ φύσει οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἐννοίᾳ οὕτω μεγάλα καὶ θεῖα

We have, therefore, no way, since we are humans, to reach that prime and holy substance. But why I am saying ‘of substance’? Not even of those things that secretly take place around it [i.e., of the divine properties and activities, which surround, so to speak, the divine essence]. For, as someone of the wise Greeks has said, “nothing of the things divine can be clearly perceived by humans” – a dictum I accept as true.

As both the context and certain common words (ἀνθρώπων / ἀνθρώποις; Θεὸν [...] τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν / τῆς θείας οὐσίας) suggest, Theodoret reproduced Gregory’s application of Xenophanes’s passage to the theological disputes of his age. Theodoret seems to have been aware of the fact that Gregory had quietly paraphrased Xenophanes. First, he explicitly refers to an (anonymous) Greek sage and quotes a dictum of his, and he also integrates, via some source containing fragment B34, some salient words from this dictum (ἄμφι θεῶν / τῶν θείων; τὸ σαφές / σαφές) into his own lines, words that do not occur in Gregory. Given that Theodoret was a doxographer who knew his Xenophanes,³²⁵ we might assume that it was rather easy for him to connect B34 with the above-quoted passage (337) from Nazianzen’s famous *2nd Theological Oration*. Moreover, when Theodoret reproduced Gregory’s passage, he omitted the words from 1 Tim. 6:16 (see *supra*, 338), which he would certainly have known, as if those words had practically nothing to add to Xenophanes’s declaration. At the same time, Theodoret quietly integrated into his own writing some salient words from Gregory’s *Oratio XXXI* 11, 9–11:

Οὐδὲ γὰρ οἶόν τε {a} τῶν εἰκαζομένων οὐδὲν πρὸς πᾶσαν ἐξικνεῖσθαι [b]
καθαρώς τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

For it is not possible to trace out any image exactly to the whole extent of the truth.³²⁶

γινώσκειν ἀνθρώποις δυνατόν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἄνδρας τηνικαῦτα κατελθούσῃ δωρεᾶ” (in Miroslav Marcovich, *Pseudo-Justinus. Cohortatio ad Graecos. De monarchia. Oratio ad Graecos* [PTS 32; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1990], 33, 9–10) (“For neither by nature nor by human conception is it possible for men to know things so great and divine, but by the gift which then descended from above upon the holy men”; tr. Marcus Dods, 454). The *Cohortatio ad Graecos* repeats the main line of argument of Pseudo-Clement presented in the above (309–315).

325 See, e.g., his *Graecarum affectionum curatio* II, 10, III, 72–73, IV, 5, 19 and 21 in Pierre Canivet, ed., *Théodoret de Cyr. Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques* (SC 57; Paris: Cerf, 1958), 139, 17–18; 191, 5–192, 1; 204, 16–21; 208, 12–14; 208, 18–19.

326 Gallay and Jourjon, 296; tr. Browne and Swallow, in Schaff and Wace, *A Select Library*, 620. Once more, the Philonic contrast between εἰκάζειν and ἀλήθεια (cf. *supra*, 290) forms the

Apparently, Theodoret had a good knowledge of Gregory's *Theological Orations* and their sources.

A similar idea occurs repeatedly in Pseudo-Justin's (Theodoret's?) *Confutatio dogmatum quorundam Aristotelicorum*:

... μὴ κατὰ τὴν ἀποδεικτικὴν ἐπιστήμην, καθ' ἣν ἐπαγγέλλονται Ἕλληνες περὶ Θεοῦ τε καὶ [8] κτίσεως {10} τοὺς λόγους {9} ποιεῖν, τοῦτο πεποιηκότας, ἀλλ' εἰκασμῶ {14} τὸ δοκοῦν [14] διορισμένους...

Κατὰ δὲ τοὺς ἀπιστήσαντας μὲν τοῖς προφητῶν λόγοις, οἰκείῳ δὲ εἰκασμῶ {14} περὶ Θεοῦ καὶ [8] κτίσεως {10} τὸ δοκοῦν [14] διορισμένους, πολλή τις ἐστὶν ἡ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τε καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς διαφωνία ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν ὄντων καὶ τῆς τούτων ἀρχῆς...

... Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἑλλήσι φιλοσόφων, ὡς κατὰ τὴν ἀποδεικτικὴν ἐπιστήμην περὶ τῶν ὄντων {8; 10} τοὺς λόγους {9} μὴ πεποιηκότων, ἀλλ' εἰκασμῶ {14} τὸ δοκοῦν [14] διορισμένων...³²⁷

... Greeks did not produce their theories of God and nature as they promise to do, i.e. in accordance with the rules of demonstrative knowledge, but they just delineated their own opinions by means of conjecture...

Among those who disbelieved what the Prophets said and preferred instead to delineate their own opinions by means of their own conjectures, there is a lot of disagreement both with each other and with one's self as far as the things and their principle are concerned...

With regard to the Greek philosophers, who did not produce their theories of the beings in accordance with the rules of demonstrative knowledge, but just delineated their own opinions by means of conjecture...

As for the doxographical source of Theodoret's knowledge of B34, it must have been akin to Arius Didymus, since, as mentioned (above, 284), Arius quotes B34 as an expression of Xenophanes's piety in terms of its sharp contrast between God and man. That is exactly the spirit of Theodoret's quotation.

This possibility is reinforced by the fact that Theodoret introduces his Gregory-Xenophanes mixed lines (intended to show the incomprehensibility of the Trinitarian dogma) by a Platonic in tenor contrast between 'intellect' and 'body' within man; whereas, Theodoret says,³²⁸ the former constituent

background to a Christian case of description of the superiority and incomprehensibility of God.

327 Pseudo-Justin, *Refutatio dogmatum quorundam Aristotelicorum* in Otto, *Justini*, 100; 104; 116 (= 110E, 111D–112A, 117D–118E *juxta* Morel).

328 Pseudo-Justin, *Expositio rectae fidei* 8 in Otto, *Justini*, 26–28 (379B3–7 *juxta* Morel).

can in principle provide us with a clear knowledge of the superior realities (ἐναργής τῶν μειζόνων κατὰληψις), the latter aggravates it so as to impede its function and frustrate us. Theodoret dresses this argument with a reference to Sap. 9:15 (βρίθει τὸ γεῶδες σκῆνος νοῦν πολυφρόντιδα), which, although formally Christian, simply stresses the Platonic air of his argument (cf., e.g., Plato, *Phaedo* 66A; 79C). Now, it should not escape our attention that Theodoret's overall passage is very close to the one from Lactantius's *De ira Dei* analysed above (318);³²⁹ the same Scriptural passage along with the same stress of the defective character of the knowledge one can achieve in this life occurs there. It seems that we have before us two typical cases of Christian reproduction of the Middle Platonic combination of Xenophanes's pious Scepticism with the doctrine of the absolute incomprehensibility of God. This combination was aptly used by Theodoret as a means of paraphrasing Gregory Nazianzen's passage quoted in the above (337–338). Indeed, Theodoret could not make the mixture of Platonism, Scepticism and Christian fideism clearer; he explicitly connects his Platonic in origin soul-body contrast with his Nazianzen-Xenophanes paraphrase by means of οὖν (“Therefore...”).³³⁰

8 *Olympiodorus*

The deacon of Alexandria Olympiodorus (early 6th cent. AD),³³¹ in his compilation entitled *Commentary on “Ecclesiastes,”*³³² fully quotes Eccles. 8:17a–i:

329 I cannot see any real relevance of the *Epistula ad Diognetum* VI, 8 with Theodoret's lines, as suggested by Otto (op. cit., 28, n. 7).

330 Pseudo-Justin, *Expositio rectae fidei* in Otto, op. cit., 28 (379C₁ juxta Morel).

331 Contra Leendert Gerrit Westerink, “The Alexandrian Commentators and the Introductions to their Commentaries,” in *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence*, ed. Richard Sorabji (New York: Cornell University Press, 1990), 325–47, at 331, Henry Chadwick thinks it probable that Olympiodorus is the same person as the commentator on Plato and Aristotle, who converted to Christianity. See “The Mind of Olympiodorus, Deacon of Alexandria,” in id., *Studies on Ancient Christianity* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), XIV: 1–6, at 2–3. On the ancient Olympiodori, see the relevant entries by Henri Dominique Saffrey and Tiziano Dorandi in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, ed. Richard Goulet (Paris: CNRS, 2005), V, 768–71 as well as Harold Tarrant's “Olympiodorus and the Surrender of Paganism,” *Byzantinischen Forschungen* 24 (1997): 181–92.

332 On the literary identity of this writing (simple *catena*, or commentary with more than one glossae on each lemma?) see Sandro Leanza, “Le catene esegetiche sull'*Ecclesiaste*,” *Augustinianum* 17, 3 (1977): 543–52; Paul Géhin, “Un nouvel inédit d'Évagre le Pontique: son *Commentaire sur l'Ecclésiaste*,” *Byzantion* 49 (1979): 188–98, at 194–95.

(a) Καὶ εἶδον σύμπαντα τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, (b) ὅτι οὐ δυνήσεται ἄνθρωπος (c) τοῦ εὑρεῖν σὺν τὸ ποίημα (d) τὸ πεποιημένον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον· (e) ὅσα ἂν μοχθήσῃ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ζητῆσαι, (f) καὶ οὐχ εὐρήσει· (g) καὶ γε ὅσα ἂν εἴπῃ ὁ σοφὸς τοῦ γινῶναι, (h) οὐ δυνήσεται τοῦ εὑρεῖν.

I have scrutinised God's whole creation: man cannot get to the bottom of everything extant under the sun; one may wear himself out in the search, but one will never find it. Whatever a sage says about what he knows, he will prove unable to find out what the case is.³³³

Then he amplifies it with this paraphrase:

Ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ γνώσις, καθ' ἣν “τὰ πάντα γέγονε” (Joh. 1:2), αὐτῷ μόνῳ τυγχάνει περιληπτή. Ἡμεῖς δέ, κἄν τι γράφωμεν καὶ γνῶμεν, “ἐκ μέρους γινώσκομεν” (1 Cor. 13:9), ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ χάριτος σοφίζόμενοι. Οὐδεὶς [2/3] οὖν “σοφός” (g), οὔτε τῶν ἔξωθεν οὔτε τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀληθινῇ “σοφίᾳ” (g) ἀρξαμένων προκόπτειν οὔτε τῶν κατὰ “ἀνθρώπους” (e) ἐφικτῶν, τελείως “δύνатаι” (h) “παντὸς” τοῦ ποιήματος {10} (a; d) τὴν “γνώσιν ἔχειν” (g). “Οὔτε” (b; f) γὰρ τὰς οὐσίας οὔτε τὰ μέτρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τυχὸν ἢ γῆς ἢ θαλάττης ἢ πῶς πεπῆγασιν ἢ ἐπὶ τίνων ἴστανται, “εὑρεῖν δυνάτον” (b; g), ἀλλὰ κἄν [11] (g) “εἴπῃ” [9] “σοφός” (g) λόγους [9] πιθανούς [cf. Xenophanes's δόκος in v. 4], τὴν ἀλήθειαν³³⁴ παντελῶς “ἀδυνατεῖ τοῦ εὑρεῖν” (h).³³⁵

God's knowledge, according to which everything has been created, has been grasped only by Him. As for us, whatever we write or think we know, in fact we have only partial knowledge, as far as we are granted wisdom by His grace. Thus, no wise man, belonging either to the heathen or to those who have started making progress in the true wisdom or to those who try to find what is attainable to man,³³⁶ is capable of fully acquiring knowledge of every creature. Indeed, it is not possible to discover

333 A substantial revision of the translation by Henry Wansbrough, *The New Jerusalem Bible. Reader's Edition* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 21990), 770.

334 Ex editionis ‘τινὰ ἀλήθειαν’ conjiciendo correxi (cf. PG 93, 584B9–10: ‘τὴν γνῶσιν’).

335 Olympiodorus, *Commentarii in “Ecclesiasten”* (PG 93, 584A13–B14). Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *In “Ecclesiasten”* 1, 12 in *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, v, *In Ecclesiasten homiliae VIII*, ed. Paul Alexander (Leiden: Brill, 1962), 293, 14–294, 17 = Vinel, *Grégoire*, 138, where the human ignorance of the divine nature is inferred from the ignorance of even the wisest man (“κἂν ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἄλλους ὦν τύχη”) about the properties and operations of the natural world (comment on Eccles. 1:8: “οὐ δυνήσεται ἀνὴρ τοῦ λαλεῖν”).

336 The text seems to be corrupted here.

the substance or the size of, e.g., the sky, or the earth, or the sea, or find out how they got their stability or whereon they stand; even if the sage expresses some convincing views, he is nevertheless absolutely incapable of discovering the truth.

All of this is a paraphrase of the *locus Scripturae* mixed with a silent paraphrase of Xenophanes's B34. Olympiodorus declares that the fundamental natural questions cannot be resolved even by the wisest men. Whatever a wise man can say on them does not exceed the realm of guess. Even Christians lack knowledge of the secrets of nature. Further, for Olympiodorus, our inability to understand the universe shows *a fortiori* our inability to understand the Creator, whose wisdom is reflected in the creation.³³⁷ Accurate knowledge is unattainable for humans; whatever we know with certainty in this life, comes from God.³³⁸

As for the philosophers' pains to disseminate their alleged intellectual achievements through their intensive literary activity, Olympiodorus reserves for them a bitter comment on Eccles. 12:12 (Υἱέ μου, φύλαξαι ποιῆσαι βιβλία πολλά· οὐκ ἔστιν περασμός, καὶ μελέτη πολλή κόπῳσις σαρκός / "My child, you must realise that writing books involves endless hard work, and that much study wearies the body");³³⁹

Ποῖα τοιγαροῦν ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής ἀποτρέπει "βιβλία" "ποιεῖν"; Τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, τῶν τὰς ἀλλήλων ἀνατρεπόντων δόξας καὶ ἀκήρυκτον πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἐχόντων πόλεμον.³⁴⁰ [...] Τὸ δὲ "οὐκ ἔστιν περασμός" ἀντὶ τοῦ "οὐκ ἔστι πέρας τῶν πόνων περὶ τὰ μάταια", ἢ ὅτι "τινὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν καρπὸν οὐκ ἔστιν εὐρεῖν" ἢ ὅτι "ἀναριθμητοὶ αἱ μυριάδες τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ φερομένων βιβλίων τυγχάνουσιν".³⁴¹

So, which books does Ecclesiastes avert us from producing? Books such as that produced by the Hellenes, who refute each other's doctrines and

337 Olympiodorus, *Commentarii in "Job"* (ed. Ursula Hagedorn and Dieter Hagedorn, *Olympiodor Diakon von Alexandrien. Kommentar zu "Hiob"* [PTS 24; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984], 315, 18–20; 325, 21–326, 2; 328, 14–16; 345, 23–346, 7). The Sceptical sense of the book of *Job* is described by Katharine T. Dell, *The Book of "Job" as Sceptical Literature* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991), 159–211.

338 Olympiodorus, *Commentarii in "Ecclesiasten"* (PG 93, 477C1–2; 480B9–11; 485B12–15; 609A2–9; 624C1–6).

339 Wansbrough, *The New Jerusalem*, 773.

340 Cf. Philo of Alexandria's description of the relationship between the various philosophical sects as a war (*supra*, 288, n. 152).

341 PG 93, 625A–C.

have launched amongst themselves an un-declared war. [...] As for the verse "...involves endless hard work,"³⁴² this stands for 'taking pains in purposeless things is endless,' or 'it is not possible to gain some fruit from it', or 'the thousands of the books dispersed all over the world are uncountable' [and yet no one can gain real profit from them].

This position is not far from Gregory Nazianzen's Sceptically-based repudiation of the alleged wisdom that is supposedly argued so convincingly for readers' profit in the long books of the philosophers (ὧν κέρδος οὐδέν; see *supra*, 336).

Part III: Echoes and Uses of Xenophanes's B34 in Byzantine Literature

1 *Views of Scepticism in Byzantium from the 7th to the Early 14th Century*

On the basis of a brief summary of the reception of Scepticism in Byzantium,³⁴³ a summary reproduced several times in various contexts,³⁴⁴ it has been stated that "Byzantine scholars and theologians, though divided by many internal controversies, could easily see Pyrrhonism as a common enemy. They felt the urge to refute the sceptical theses."³⁴⁵ As we shall see, this claim is simply a wrong guess as to what the extant evidence tells us about the Byzantine period. As we shall also see, contrary to the traditional view that "it was not until some fourteen hundred years after Sextus Empiricus's death [i.e., in seventeenth-century Europe] that his writings and his thought again occupied the centre of

342 Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Julianum* v (PG 76, 773D): "ψυχρά τὰ Ἑλλήνων καὶ τὸ εἰκαῖον ἔχοντα πολὺ καὶ μακρῶν ἰδρώτων ἐπ' οὐδενὶ ζημίαν" / "Hellenic learning is ineffective and pointless, and requires much effort for no reward" (tr. Norman Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria* [London and New York: Routledge, 2000], 203, slightly changed).

343 Charles B. Schmitt, "The Rediscovery of Ancient Skepticism in Modern Times," in *The Skeptical Tradition*, ed. Myles Burnyeat (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1983), 234–35.

344 See, e.g., Peter S. Fosl, "The Bibliographic Bases of Hume's Understanding of Sextus Empiricus and Pyrrhonism," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 36, 2 (1998): 261–78, at 263.

345 Luciano Floridi, "The Rediscovery and Posthumous Influence of Scepticism" in *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Scepticism*, ed. Richard Bett (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 267–87 at 277.

the philosophical stage,”³⁴⁶ Sextus’s extant writings contributed greatly to the formation of Late Byzantine philosophical and theological debates.³⁴⁷

In the *Dialectica* by John of Damascus (ca. 655–ca. 745) – which forms the first or, as the author says, the ‘instrumental’ piece of his much-read trilogy, *Fountain of Knowledge* (ca. 743 AD)³⁴⁸ – there occurs a brief refutation of Pyrrhonism, which John presents as a subversion of philosophy altogether. Must this passage be seen as a serious, conscious rejection of Pyrrhonism? The problem that the positive answer³⁴⁹ faces is not so much that John’s refutation is unoriginal in content, as it is the fact that the *ipsissima verba* of this passage³⁵⁰ were mechanically copied from another source or sources (namely, from the commentators Elias and/or David,³⁵¹ or from Ammonius and/or John of Philoponus as well).³⁵² This fact allows for some doubt as to whether John seriously committed himself to tackling the epistemological problems posed by Scepticism. It rather suggests that he included the commentators’ anti-Sceptical argument from self-refutation just to show his readers in an easy way that knowledge is possible. After all, the very title of John’s trilogy assumes the existence of knowledge.

This reservation – that John had no real interest in attacking Pyrrhonism – seems to hold true for the entire philosophical and theological content of

346 Annas and Barnes, *The Modes*, 18.

347 I would even go so far as to hypothesize that these writings were partially preserved because of the Late Byzantine interest in them.

348 Andrew Louth, “The Πηγή γνώσεως of St. John Damascene: its Date and Development,” in *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. Charalambos Dendrinos, Jonathan Harris, Eirene Harvalia-Crook, and Judith Herrin (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 335–40.

349 See, e.g., John G. Dellis, “Ο ἀντι-σκεπτικισμὸς καὶ ἡ λογικὴ ὡς ὄργανον τῆς φιλοσοφίας” στὰ Διαλεκτικά τοῦ Ἰωάννου Δαμασκηνοῦ,” in “Πορευθέντες”: Τόμος χαριστήριος πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλβανίας Ἀναστασίου (Γιαννουλάτου), ed. Elias Boulgarakes and Gregorios Ziakas (Athens: Harmos, 1997), 91–92 (Summary) and 361–73 (at 365–8).

350 John of Damascus, *Dialectica* III, 50–57: “Ἀλλ’ ἀναιρεῖν ἐπεχείρησάν τινες τὴν φιλοσοφίαν φάσκοντες μὴ εἶναι ταύτην μηδὲ εἶναι γινώσιν τινα ἢ κατὰληψιν. Πρὸς οὓς ἐροῦμεν· πῶς φατε μὴ εἶναι φιλοσοφίαν καὶ γινώσιν καὶ κατὰληψιν, ἐγνωκότες καὶ κατελιγφότες ἢ μὴ ἐγνωκότες μηδὲ κατελιγφότες; Εἰ μὲν οὖν κατελιγφότες, ἰδοὺ ἔστι γινώσις καὶ κατὰληψις· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐγνωκότες, οὐδεὶς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει περὶ πράγματος διαλεγόμενοις οὐ τὴν γινώσιν οὐ κατελιγφατε” (in Bonifatius Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, I, *Institutio elementaris. Capita philosophica (Dialectica)* [PTS 7; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969], 57).

351 See the apparatus fontium by Kotter, ad loc.

352 Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 35–37. Cf. Hansueli Flückiger, “The Ἐφεκτικοί in the Commentators” in *Philosophy and Doxography in the Imperial Age*, ed. Aldo Brancacci (Florence: Olschki, 2005), 113–30; id., “Scepticism in the Sixth Century? Damascius’ *Doubts and Solutions concerning the First Principles*,” *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 36, 3 (1998): 337–63, at 338–43.

John of Damascus's *Fountain of Knowledge*. Note, for instance, that John himself explicitly declared the compilatory nature of the *Fountain*. Indeed, with amusing consistency, John made even that declaration using other people's words.³⁵³ Be that as it may, we should not lose of sight of the fact that John's *Fountain* does not combat Pyrrhonism from a religious or theological standpoint. On the contrary, he quite naturally accepted that our knowledge has its own limits. For instance, in his *Expositio fidei*, when referring to various theories of the shape of the heavens as well as to the question of the nature of heavens, he states (probably based on Basil of Caesarea's *Hexaemeron* I, 10) that man is unable to resolve such issues and we must be content with holding that everything has been created by God and as God has willed.³⁵⁴

The Patriarch of Constantinople Photius (ca. 820–897/8), in his recension of Aenesidemus's lost eight-volume *Pyrrhonian Discourses*,³⁵⁵ discarded Pyrrhonism *tout-court*:

Οἱ μὲν οὖν τοῦ Αἰνησιδήμου Λόγοι πρὸς τοιοῦτον ἀγῶνα κονίζονται· ὅτι δὲ ματαιότης αὐτῶν καὶ πολλὴ λέσχη ἢ σπουδὴ, Πλάτωνί τε καὶ πολλοῖς ἄλλοις τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν τὸν ἔλεγχον ἔδοσαν· καὶ ὅτι μηδὲν εἰς δόγμα συντελεῖ, καὶ τοῦτο κατὰδῆλον, ὅπου γε καὶ τὰς ἐνούσας δογματικὰς θεωρίας ἐλαύνειν ἡμῶν τῆς διανοίας ἐπεχείρησαν.³⁵⁶

353 John A. Demetracopoulos, "In Search of the Pagan and Christian Sources of John of Damascus' Theodicy: Ammonius, the Son of Hermeias, Stephanus of Athens and John Chrysostom on God's Foreknowledge and Predestination and Man's Freewill" in *Byzantine Theology and its Philosophical Background*, ed. Antonio Rigo and Michele Trizio (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 50–86. Cf. id., *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 161, n. 57.

354 John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei* 20, ll. 42–60 and 81–82 in Bonifatius Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, II, "Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως – *Expositio fidei* (PTS 12; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1973), 52–53. See discussion in Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 264–65, n. 493.

355 Photius's summary seems to be excellent: see Immanuel Bekker, ed., *Photii Constantino-politani Bibliotheca*, II (Berlin: Reimer, 1825), 169b37–170a38. As I have argued, it probably includes some literal quotations from Aenesidemus: see John A. Demetracopoulos, "Ο κώδικας 212 τῆς Μυριοβίβλου τοῦ Φωτίου: Αἰνησιδήμου Πυρρωνεῖοι λόγοι. Κείμενο, μετάφραση, ἐρμηνευτικὰ σχόλια" ("Codex 212 of Photius' *Bibliotheca*: 'Aenesidemus, *Pyrrhonian Discourses*.' Text, Translation, and Annotation"), *Βυζαντιακά* 19 (1999): 347–99, at 362–63. These quotations must be added to the ones extracted from Sextus Empiricus's reproduction of the content of Aenesidemus's writing; see Brigitte Pérez, "Énésidème," in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, ed. Richard Goulet, III (Paris: CNRS, 2000), 90–99, at 94.

356 Photius, *Bibliotheca* 212 (ed. René Henry, *Photius. Bibliothèque*, III [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1962], 122 = in Bekker, *Photii*, 170b36–171a1). Cf. Demetracopoulos, "Ο κώδικας 212," 356; 386 ad 170b37.

Such is the struggle that Aenesidemus undertakes in his treatise. Plato and many others before us³⁵⁷ have given a demonstration that his efforts are folly and empty talk. It is also clear that these efforts make no contribution to philosophical doctrine, as these treatises attempt to remove from our minds even such philosophical ideas as we had.³⁵⁸

Still, no specific hint at the potential danger that Scepticism poses to faith occurs in Photius's lines. Admittedly, when writing his *Bibliotheca*, Photius thought and acted foremost as a philologist, and in consequence duly confined his recension of Aenesidemus's writing to the philosophical realm, namely to the realm that the *Pyrrhonian Discourses* belong to. Still, apart from the truism presumably accepted by Photius – as by all Christian thinkers – that Scepticism is incompatible with firm acceptance of Christian beliefs, the fact remains that he did not express any uneasiness about Scepticism on account of his religious identity or theological profession. What Photius does not accept in this respect is what he vaguely (and trivially) calls 'sophistry' in theology. Indeed, he says so explicitly³⁵⁹ when commenting on Gregory Nazianzen's *Oration XXVIII* 11, ll. 1–4.³⁶⁰ Still, Photius abstained from identifying such sophistry or extravagant argumentative spirit with Scepticism, and did not even suggest a rhetorical identification, as Philo of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen had done before him.³⁶¹ In sum, there is no evidence that Photius in principle viewed Scepticism as a threat to Christian faith.

Michael Psellus (1018–ca. 1076),³⁶² one of the major contributors to the revival of philosophical interests at Byzantium, occasionally implies that Ephectic philosophy is an extreme form of doubt that yields a propensity

357 On the sources (primarily Ammonius, John Philoponus, and David) of Photius's description of Plato as an effective anti-Sceptic (on the basis of *Theaetetus* 171A–B) see Demetracopoulos, "Ο κώδικας 212," 387–88 (*ad* 170b38). On the exposition and refutation of Scepticism in the Aristotelian Commentators see the excellent articles by Flückiger cited *supra* (352, n. 352).

358 Tr. Nigel G. Wilson, *Photius: The Bibliotheca* (London: Duckworth, 1994), 188, slightly modified.

359 Photius, *Amphilochia* LXXVIII, 174–80 (ed. Leendert Gerrit Westerink, *Photius. Epistulae et Amphilochia*, v, *Amphilochiorum pars altera* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1986], 106–107); see Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 139.

360 Gallay and Jourjon, *Grégoire*, 122.

361 See *supra*, 286; Demetracopoulos, "Gregory Nazianzen: Sceptic," 118–126.

362 On the date of Psellos's death see Anthony Kaldellis, "The Date of Psellos' Death Once Again: Psellos Was Not the Michael of Nicomedeia Mentioned by Attaleiates," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 104, 2 (2011): 651–64.

for counter-argument.³⁶³ Further, following Photius's line, he also explicitly rejects Ephectic philosophy on account of the thoroughly subversive character of the doubt it preaches:³⁶⁴

Φιλοσοφία [...] παρ' ἡμῖν μὲν οὐκ ἀμφιβάλλεται, παρὰ δέ τισιν ἀνατρέπεται, ἥγουν τοῖς Ἐφεκτικοῖς φιλοσόφοις.

In my spirit, philosophy is not put in doubt, although in some others, namely the Ephectic philosophers, it is subverted.

Here, Psellus quotes almost verbatim from David's exposition and refutation of the Sceptical refutation of (Dogmatic) philosophy *en bloc*.³⁶⁵ Obviously, Psellus does not attack Scepticism in the name of and for the sake of faith, but on account of its subversion of philosophy, whose value he fervently defends. As for theology, Psellus is fully prepared to admit that the human mind has its limits and that these limits are narrow. He explicitly attacks the epistemological optimism of one of the main philosophical schools of Antiquity, i.e., Stoicism, and he sharply contrasts human ignorance to divine wisdom. In so doing, he aligns himself with the traditional alliance of Christian faith with Scepticism.³⁶⁶

In the late 13th–early 14th century, at the dawn of the 'Paleologan Renaissance,' Nicephoros Choumnos (ca. 1250–1327), in the preface to the first of his natural treatises (*On the Universe and its Nature*), seems to suggest an optimistic, progressive way to supersede Scepticism:

363 Michael Psellus, *Oratoria minora* xxx, 137: "[...] καὶ αὐτοῖς ἂν Ἐφεκτικοῖς ἀναμφίλεκτον" in Antony Robert Littlewood, ed., *Michaelis Pselli oratoria minora* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1985), 115.

364 Michael Psellus, *Opuscula logica, physica, allegorica* xlix, 48–51, in John M. Duffy, ed., *Michaelis Pselli philosophica minora* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1992), 179.

365 David, *Prolegomena philosophiae*: "... ἔλθωμεν καὶ τοὺς λόγους τῶν βουλομένων ἀνελεῖν τὴν ὑπαρξίν τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἐκθώμεθα καὶ τούτων τὴν ἀνατροπὴν ὡς οἶόν τέ ἐστι ποιησώμεθα. Πρῶτον μὲν ἐπιχείρημα τῶν ἀνατρεπόντων τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἐστὶ... Ἀνατρέποντες οὖν τὸ ἐπιχείρημα τῶν ἀνατρεπόντων τὴν φιλοσοφίαν... Τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἐπιχείρημα τῶν ἀνατρεπόντων τὴν φιλοσοφίαν... Τρίτον δὲ ἐπιχείρημα οἱ ἀνατρέποντες τὴν φιλοσοφίαν φασι τοῦτο... Τὸ τέταρτον ἐπιχείρημα τῶν ἀνατρεπόντων τὴν φιλοσοφίαν..." in Busse, *Davidis Prolegomena et In Porphyrii "Isagogen" Commentarium*, 2, 31–3, 2; 3, 10–11; 3, 32; 6, 23–24. Here David does not mention the Sceptics explicitly; presumably, Psellus combined the above lines with an explicit reference to the Sceptics drawn from other commentators, i.e., Ammonius, Elias, and John Philoponus.

366 The relevant passages are quoted and discussed in Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 89–90.

Ἐπεὶ μὴ πᾶσι ταῦτά τοις περὶ τούτου [sc. περὶ κόσμου φύσεως] πεφιλοσοφηκόσι, ἄλλοις δ' ἄλλα καὶ δέδοκται καὶ λέλεκται, λείπεται καὶ τοῖς μετ' ἐκείνους, ἔτι τῆς ἀληθείας ζήτησιν ἐχούσης, προσεπινοεῖν καὶ προσεξευρίσκειν ὀρθὸν δῆπου γε [...].³⁶⁷

Since not all of those who have philosophized on this subject matter [sc. on the nature of the world] have held and expressed the same views, but different persons have held different views, it is the task of those who come to live after them, since truth is still sought after, to conceive of and further discover what might be correct [...].

Choumnos's point here fully coincides with the way Sextus Empiricus describes philosophers' disagreement on the non-evident things:

Ἄλλου δὲ ἄλλως εἰκάζοντος καὶ διαπιθανευομένου φύεται ἡ διαφωνία.

But when one man guesses and tries to persuade in one way, another in another, disputation springs up.³⁶⁸

Further, Sextus, in the opening chapter of his *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, classifies as Sceptics (Οἱ Σκεπτικοί) those philosophers who neither accept nor reject any statement, but ἔτι ζητοῦσιν.³⁶⁹ Apparently, Nicephoros tries to “turn what the Sceptics rather negatively call *dissensio philosophorum* and ‘perpetual seeking after truth’ into a positive starting point.”³⁷⁰

Choumnos clarifies that original contributions to the perennial problems discussed in the long course of philosophical investigation must not result from a quarrelsome spirit, because that would fall short of the standards of philosophy.³⁷¹ Rather, one must try to draw conclusions on the basis of universally accepted principles and definitions:

367 Nicephoros Choumnos, *Philosophical Treatises* I, in Konstantinos P. Chrestou, ed., *Tò φιλοσοφικὸ ἔργο τοῦ Νικηφόρου Χοῦμνου* (Thessaloniki: Kyromanos, 2002), I, 6–10.

368 Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus mathematicos*, VIII, 324 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 177; tr. Bury, *Sextus*, II, 409).

369 Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* I, 4 (Mau, *Sexti*, I, 4).

370 John A. Demetracopoulos, “Nikephoros Choumnos,” in *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy: Philosophy from 500 to 1500*, ed. Henrik Lagerlund (Dordrecht: Springer, 2011), 895–97, at 896.

371 Nicephoros Choumnos, *Philosophical Treatises* I: “φιλοτιμίας χάριν μόνον καὶ ἀντιλογίας· ὃ δὴ καὶ ἀφιλόσοφον ἔγωγε παντελῶς νομίζω” (cf. Plato, *Phaedo* 91A1–2) / “only from one’s vainglory and spirit of contradiction, which I definitely think it throughout unphiloso-

Δεῖ δὲ μᾶλλον τῶν ἀρχῶν καὶ τῶν ὄρων ἀσφαλῶς κειμένων τῶν καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνωμολογημένων, ἐκ τούτων τὰς ἀποδείξεις πειρᾶσθαι ποιεῖσθαι [...].³⁷²

Rather, we must posit with caution the principles and the definitions, which are conceded by all, and try to produce our demonstrations out of them [...].

This is exactly how Sextus Empiricus describes the general method of Dogmatic philosophies, and finding their constructive project impossible, he forthwith embarks upon his own destructive project, namely to break down the very foundations of every sort of knowledge, i.e., ‘the principles’:

Ἐπεὶ οὖν τῶν ἀρχῶν διαβληθεῖσιν οὐδὲ αἱ κατὰ μέρος ἀποδείξεις αὐτοῖς δύνανται προκόπτειν, λέγωμεν τὰ ἀρμόζοντα πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς.

So, since their particular proofs cannot go forward when the principles are under suspicion, let us state suitable arguments against the principles.³⁷³

Choumnos says that it would be wrong to imitate those who begin their treatises by refuting the views of their predecessors.³⁷⁴ Obviously, it is Aristotle’s *Physics* that he has principally in mind here, for he adds that this refutation does not form an organic part of the treatment of any subject matter (Book I, 184b15–192b2). Still, it seems that he had Sextus in mind, too, for he adds that it would be wrong to blame previous philosophers for using demonstration, since demonstration is for them *e limine* the only possible way of drawing conclusions.³⁷⁵ Now, Aristotle did not launch this particular charge of quarrelsomeness against the Presocratics and Plato; rather, Sextus Empiricus launched

sophical” in Chrestou, op. cit., I, 11–14; 2, 4–9). Cf. Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* I, 6: “Πρὸς ἕκαστον μέρος τῆς καλουμένης φιλοσοφίας ἀντιλέγομεν” (Mau, *Sexti*, I, 5) / “We state our objections regarding the several divisions of so-called philosophy” (tr. Bury, *Sextus*, I, 5).

372 Nicephoros Choumnos, *Philosophical Treatises* I, in Chrestou, op. cit., I, 14–17.

373 Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus mathematicos* III, 18 (Mau, *Sexti*, III, 111; tr. Bury, *Sextus*, IV, 254). In this passage, Sextus refers to the principles of geometry; still, he applies this rationale to every branch of knowledge.

374 Nicephoros Choumnos, *Philosophical Treatises* I in Chrestou, op. cit., I, 21–25.

375 “Μηδ’ ἔστιν [...] τὸν τῆς ἀποδείξεως αἰτιάσασθαι τρόπον, ὅτι χωρὶς τούτων οὐκ ἔῃν συμπεραίνειν” / “It is not possible [...] to blame on demonstration as method, because without it it would be impossible to draw any conclusion” (Nicephoros Choumnos, *ibid.* in Chrestou, op. cit., 2, 3–4).

it against all the non-Sceptic natural philosophers.³⁷⁶ Indeed, Sextus, in his *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, wrote two specific chapters (II,18: “On Demonstration”; II,19: “Whether There Is Demonstration”) and in the *Adversus Mathematicos* three long chapters (VIII,4: “On Demonstration”; VIII,5: “What Demonstration Is Made Of”; VIII,8: “Whether There Is Demonstration”) in order to show that Dogmatic philosophers cannot construct any real demonstration at all, let alone one conducted in their own terms.³⁷⁷

In sum, it appears that Choumnos was aware of some fundamental Sceptical arguments laid down by Sextus Empiricus and tried to overcome them in the prolegomena to his natural treatises, which explicitly lay claim to some originality.

The Greek Patristic mixture of Scepticism with fideism was plainly held by Theodore Metochites (1270–1330), whose view of Scepticism, as has been amply shown elsewhere, was openly much more positive than negative.³⁷⁸ Metochites combined Scepticism with Platonism along the lines drawn by Philo of Alexandria.³⁷⁹

Metochites's most important disciple, Nicephoros Gregoras (ca. 1296–1361), led his mentor's Scepticism to extremes. Relying directly on Philo of Alexandria³⁸⁰ as well as on Sextus Empiricus,³⁸¹ Gregoras held a strongly

376 Notice here how closely Aristotle resembles the quarrelsome Sceptics in Choumnos's mind. Of course, this negative view about Aristotle had a long history in Byzantium and Late Antiquity: see Eva de Vries-van Der Velden, *Théodore Métochite. Une réévaluation* (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1987), 105–17; Börje Bydén, “‘No Prince of Perfection’: Byzantine anti-Aristotelianism in the Byzantine Era from the Patristic Period to Pletho,” in *Power and Subversion in Byzantium*, ed. Dimiter Angelov and Michael Saxby (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013), 147–176 (Point A2).

377 Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* II, 134–92 (Mau, *Sexti*, I, 97–113); *Adversus Mathematicos* VIII, 300–481 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 172–212).

378 Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 84–87; Börje Bydén, “‘To Every Argument There Is a Counter-Argument’. Theodore Metochites' Defence of Skepticism (*Semeiosis* 61),” in *Byzantine Philosophy and its Ancient Sources*, ed. Katerina Ierodiakonou (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 183–217.

379 See Demetracopoulos, *ibid.*

380 See Demetracopoulos, *op. cit.*, 94–100; Bydén, “‘To Every Argument,’” 207, n. 80.

381 In a previous study (Demetracopoulos, *op. cit.*, 99), I argued that the evidence is inconclusive on whether Gregoras had used, apart from Philo, Sextus Empiricus or Diogenes Laertius in his reproduction of the modes of Aenesidemus. An explicit direct quotation of Sextus's *Adversus Mathematicos* IX, 19–21 in Gregoras's *Explicatio in librum Synesii “De insomniis”* (Paolo Pietrosanti, ed., *Nicephori Gregorae Explicatio in librum Synesii “De insomniis.” Scholia cum glossis* [Bari: Levante, 1999], 36) leaves no doubt that Gregoras has read his Sextus, even if he did so in a peculiar way that I hope to explain elsewhere.

Sceptical form of Christian Platonism.³⁸² In an epistle of his, which probably dates from 1328/32,³⁸³ he argues that postlapsarian humanity is virtually unable to detect not only what God is and what His ways are, but also the simple processes of nature:

Εἰ γάρ τοι τὰ γιγνόμενα κατὰ ταῦτὸν ἐς τὸ αἰεὶ διεγίγνετο πρὸς τε γένεσιν καὶ φθοράν, ἀμετάβλητος ἂν ᾗν ἡ μεταβολὴ καὶ ἀκίνητος ἡ κίνησις καὶ τὸ ἄστατον στάσιμον. Νῦν δὲ ἀναμιξ πάντα [10] καὶ ὥσπερ ἀχλὺς τις διορᾶν {5} βουλομένοις ἡμῖν κατακέχυται.³⁸⁴ Καὶ οὐ μέντ' ἂν οὕτ' ἴσμεν {2/5} οὔτε ποτ' εἰσόμεθα [6/7] ἅττα [9] ποτέ ἐστὶν ἀσφαλῶς {1} τὰ γιγνόμενα.

If the generated things acted all time the same way in the circle of their generation and passing away, change would be unchanged, movement immovable and the instability stable. Yet now, in this life everything is mixed up and diffused like haze, which impedes us in our efforts to see what goes on. And we neither know nor will ever know unmistakably what sort of things are the beings that belong to the realm of generation.³⁸⁵

The idea, *ignoramus et ignorabimus*, expressed here in terms of a flagrant emphasis on the Heraclitean aspect of Platonism, occurs in some Christian authors before Gregoras (e.g., in John Philoponus and Michael Psellos).³⁸⁶ Still, it is only Gregoras who expresses the idea in a wording so similar to Xenophanes's B34. Instead of grasping the certain truth (τῶν ὄντων ἀκριβῆς κατάληψις), the

382 Demetracopoulos, op. cit., 80–83; 111–16; 120; 122; 310–17; id., “Thomas Aquinas,” 361–62; 383; cf. id., “Gregoras, Nikephoros” in *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy*, 897–99 (at 898–99). Gregoras’s reproduction of Gregory Nazianzen’s *Oration xxi* 12 (see Demetracopoulos, “Gregory Nazianzen: Sceptic,” 116–117) has traditionally been mistaken for an anti-Sceptical polemic: see Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 101–103.

383 This is the time when its addressee, Maximos Magistros, was in Thessaloniki, where the letter was sent; see: *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit. Erstellt von Erich Trapp unter Mitarbeit von Hans-Veit Beyer, Rainer Walther und anderen*, 7 (Vienna: ÖAW, 1985), N° 16048.

384 As noted in the *apparatus fontium*, the ‘ἀχλὺς κατακέχυται’ is Homeric in origin. Still, this phrase was applied, just as Gregoras does, to the sensible world by Philo of Alexandria, *De Abrahamo* 79 (Cohn, *Philonis*, Vol. IV, 19, 13–14); see also *De specialibus legibus* III, 4 (Cohn, *Philonis*, Vol. V, 151, 3). This is another instance of Gregoras’s innumerable borrowings from Philo.

385 Nicephoros Gregoras, *Epistle 34*, 59–61 in Pietro Luigi M. Leone, ed., *Nicephori Gregorae epistulae*, II (Matino: Typografia di Matino, 1982), 128–29.

386 Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 89–93.

best one can do is to create poor conjectures (στοχασμός ἀμυδρὸς ἀληθείας) on the basis of the sense data printed on the soul.³⁸⁷ Gregoras dresses his idea of the incomprehensibility of the natural world with some crucial vocabulary (ἀνήνυτα μοχθεῖν etc.) from Eccles. 8:17 (ὅσα ἂν μοχθήσῃ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ζητῆσαι, καὶ οὐχ εὐρήσει; cf. Eccles. 3:10–11; see *supra*, 349) and Gregory of Nyssa's comment on a very similar passage (1:3) from the same Biblical book.³⁸⁸ Further, Gregoras accounts for the incomprehensibility of the natural world in the same way as Philo of Alexandria (cf. *supra*, 292): in terms of its very nature, namely, mutability. As for Gregoras's τὰ γιγνόμενα, this is a phrase typically used in Platonism for the realm of the sensible beings. Last, Gregoras's stress of the incomprehensibility of the natural processes has an explicitly described aim, i.e. to combat the 'heathen' error that these processes 'have nothing admirable' and must be seen as self-explained (τὸ αὐτόματον), i.e. as explained in terms of certain immanent metaphysical principles such as 'matter' with its 'indefiniteness' (τὸ ἀόριστον) and 'numerical reasons' (ἀριθμητικοὶ λόγοι), which produce an eternal recycling of beings.³⁸⁹ Every created being, Gregoras argues, exists and acts "in accordance with the hidden reasons of Providence" (οἱ τῆς προνοίας ἀπόρρητοι λόγοι).³⁹⁰

In fact, Gregoras depends on Philo as far as the very wording of his lines are concerned. As noted in the *apparatus fontium* in the edition of Gregoras's *Epistle*, the ἀχλὺς κατακέχυνται is Homeric in origin. Still, this phrase was applied, like in Gregoras, to the sensible world by Philo in various places in his writings,³⁹¹ including the *De ebrietate* 166, where, as has been seen (292), Xenophanes's fragment B34 is echoed. This renders it highly probable that Gregoras was aware of this echo and that he set out to make it more explicit in his own lines by paraphrasing Xenophanes's emphatic negation οὐ τις ἀνὴρ

387 Nicephoros Gregoras, *Florentius* 1618–32 in Pietro Luigi M. Leone, *Niceforo Gregora. Fiorenzo o intorno alla sapienza* (Naples: Università di Napoli, 1975), 123–24.

388 Gregory of Nyssa, *In "Ecclesiasten"* 1 in Alexander, *Gregorii*, v, 286, 19. The phrase used by Gregory goes back to Plato, who uses it in a similar context (*Republic* 531A3). The occurrences of the phrase in Epicurus and Porphyry mentioned in the *apparatus fontium* of Leone's edition of Gregoras's text are irrelevant.

389 Nicephoros Gregoras, *Epistle xxxiv*, 23–34, in Leone, *Nicephori*, 127–28.

390 Op. cit. 62–63, in Leone, 129.

391 Philo of Alexandria, *De Abrahamo* 79; in Cohn, *Philonis*, iv, 19, 13–14; *De specialibus legibus* III, 4, in Cohn, *Philonis*, v, 151, 3. This is another instance of Gregoras's innumerable borrowings from Philo. Still, one should figure out if this idea can be traced back to Plutarch, too (see *supra*, 294).

ἴδεν οὐδέ τις ἔσται εἰδῶς [...] ἄσσα... (Gregoras: οὐτ' ἴσμεν οὔτε ποτ' εἰσόμεθα ἄττα...).³⁹²

This truth about our limits, Gregoras says, was realised both by heathen sages and by those truly wise men, the Christian intellectuals. Gregoras quotes here³⁹³ in an abridged form Gregory Nazianzen's *Oratio XXVIII*, 22–25,³⁹⁴ which is, at least in part, based on Sextus Empiricus's *Pyrrhonian Outlines* I, 56–78 (Aenesidemus's first mode of Scepticism).³⁹⁵ Gregoras, who knew his Sextus, was able to recognise Nazianzen's source. Further, Gregoras remarks (quoting silently but accurately from Gregory of Nyssa) that apodeictic syllogisms cannot provide us with certainty about the truthfulness of their conclusions.³⁹⁶ God, Gregoras states,³⁹⁷ did not create the world for us to understand it. Quite the contrary: we are to remain ignorant of it and thereby admire it and its Creator. God, Gregoras says with an oxymoron, put us within a far-rago (χυκεών) that supersedes everything we can think and say (ὑπὲρ πάντα λόγον) in order to let us apprehend what can no way be taken as stable and apprehensible (... καταλαμβάνειν ὁπόσα μή ποτ' ἂν σχοίῃ πεπηγὸς οὐδὲν ὃ ἂν κατελήφθαι δοκοίῃ).³⁹⁸ Gregory Nazianzen³⁹⁹ expresses even this idea in strikingly Sceptico-Philonic terms.⁴⁰⁰

392 ἄττα is just the Attic form for ἄσσα. Cf. Aristophanes's change of Xenophanes's 'ἄσσα' to 'ἄττ' " (*supra*, 257).

393 Nicephoros Gregoras, op. cit. 1640–63 in Leone, op. cit., 124–25. Elsewhere (*Epistle III*, ll. 166–67 in Leone, *Nicephori*, 25–26), Gregoras seems to express the Platonic doctrine of the human body as hindrance to knowledge in partially Xenophanean terms: "... ἡμεῖς μετὰ σώματος ὄντες ἄρτι ἀδυνατοῦμεν "ὕγιές" τι "καὶ ἀληθές" {1} (cf. Plato, *Phaedo* 69B8; 90D3–4; *Phaedrus* 242E5–6; *Respublica* 603B1–2; Philo of Alexandria, *De cherubim* 127) ἐννοεῖν περὶ τῶν θείων [8]" ("... We, while still being in this bodily state, are unable to understand anything sane and true about the divine matters").

394 Not *Oratio XX*, 11 (Mossay and Lafontaine, ed., *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours* 20–23, 78–80), as Leone suggests (op. cit., 124, app. font. ad l. 1642 sqq.); Leone has been misled by the similarity of some phrases in the two Orations.

395 Mau, *Sexti*, I, 17–21.

396 Gregory of Nyssa, *Dialogus de anima et resurrectione* (PG 46, 52B–C). On this borrowing see Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 207, n. 271.

397 Nicephoros Gregoras, *Florentius*, 1621–24 in Leone, *Niceforo*, 123.

398 Nicephoros Gregoras, *Epistle XXXIV*, 52–56 in Leone, *Nicephori*, 128.

399 Christopher A. Beeley, *Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God. 'In Your Light We Shall See Light'* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 100–101.

400 See in the main Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio XVII* 4 (PG 35, 969D–973A): "Κινεῖται τὸ πᾶν καὶ σαλευέται... τοῖς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἀπαντῶσί τε καὶ συμπιέτουσιν... Διὰ τῆς ἀνωμαλίας τῶν ὁρμωμένων καὶ περιτρεπομένων... Οὐδὲν ἀκίνητον, οὐδὲν ὁμαλόν...". Gregory focuses on the mutability of human life. Still, at the very beginning of his paragraph, he explicitly

Nicholas Cabasilas (ca. 1319/23–post 1391) produced in *Contra Pyrrhonem* (probably written between 1355 and 1361, but unfinished)⁴⁰¹ a philosophical attack on the logical consistency of Scepticism. The full title of his work labels ‘Pyrrho’ (whose name he used, in accordance with tradition, to denote Scepticism) as ‘accursed.’⁴⁰² No theological elements or even hints of such elements can be traced in this short writing; its content is absolutely secular. Further, as I have argued elsewhere, the old hypothesis that Nicholas, by attacking Scepticism, intended to support Gregory Palamas’s theology against the so-called ‘scepticism’ of Barlaam the Calabrian, is unfounded; “the *Contra Pyrrhonem* is an attempt at refuting philosophical, not theological scepticism.”⁴⁰³ Of course, the word ‘accursed’ cannot but imply that Nicholas deemed Scepticism a philosophy to be rejected on religious grounds as well. Still, it seems that what troubled him was not his contemporaries’ alleged secular trend towards pure Scepticism, or even Scepticism as such, but rather Nicephoros Gregoras’s radical undermining of postlapsarian man’s capacity to reach truth and exercise moral judgment. Opting for an Aristotle-based, optimistic view of man, which was partially inspired by Thomas Aquinas,⁴⁰⁴

says that this mutability is just part of the inexplicable mutability of the entire created world. On the Philonic provenance of Nazianzen’s concept and wording see Trisoglio, “Filone Alessandrino,” 633; 638; 675. See also *supra*, 293, where the objective unknowability of the created beings is accounted for in terms of the divine providence. Gregoras’s predilection for Philo presumably derives from his mentor, Theodore Metochites (see Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 88–100; Ioannis D. Polemis, “Η ἡδονὴ τῆς θεωρίας τῶν ὄντων στὸν Θεόδωρο Μετοχίτη: ἐπιδράσεις τοῦ Φίλωνος τοῦ Ἰουδαίου καὶ τοῦ Συνεσίου στὸν Ἡθικόν,” *Ἑλληνικά* 49 (1999): 245–75, at 247–68; id., “Η κατὰ νοὺν ζωὴ: μὴ ἀπόπειρα ἐρμηνείας τῶν δοκιμίων 51 καὶ 410 [sc. 90] τῶν Γνωμικῶν ὑποσημειώσεων τοῦ Θεοδώρου Μετοχίτη,” *Ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Θράκης. Περίοδος Β΄: Τεῦχος Τμήματος Φιλολογίας* 8 (1999): 185–206, at 192; id., *Θεόδωρος Μετοχίτης. Ἡθικός ἢ περὶ παιδείας* (Athens: Kanaki, 2002), 40*–41*; 45*, n. 86; 46*, n. 90; 52*–68*; 76*–80*; 83*; 89*; 110*; 112*, n. 234; 122*–23*; 126*, n. 256; id., *Θεόδωρος Μετοχίτης. Περί τοῦ μαθηματικοῦ εἶδους τῆς φιλοσοφίας, καὶ μάλιστα περὶ τοῦ ἀρμονικοῦ. Ποίημα 10* (Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 2007), 114*; 127*–28*; id., *Θεόδωρος Μετοχίτης. Οἱ δύο βασιλικοὶ λόγοι* (Athens 2007), 87–95; 325, n. 204; 375, n. 257; John A. Demetracopoulos, “Theodoros Metochites” in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Begründet von F. Überweg. Die Philosophie des Mittelalters, I, i, Jüdische und byzantinische Philosophie. Bandteil: Byzantinische Philosophie*, ed. Georgi Kapriev, Basel (forthcoming).

401 See Demetracopoulos, op. cit., 116–18.

402 Nicholas Cabasilas, *Contra Pyrrhonem*, l. 3 in Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 18; cf. op. cit., 80–82.

403 See Demetracopoulos, op. cit., 64–80; 309–10.

404 Demetracopoulos, “Thomas Aquinas,” 336–38; 361–62; see also 382; 404–405.

Nicholas left no room for Scepticism; he only recognised, in Thomistic terms, that man, in this life, cannot have a direct knowledge of God, though he will enjoy that knowledge in the future life.⁴⁰⁵ Nicholas's concern was not to defend religion or theology against some Sceptical threat, but to construct a sane mixture of theology with philosophy against some trendy mixture of his age, i.e., the mixture of Scepticising Platonism with Christianity.

2 Gregory Palamas's Explicit Quotation of B34 and his Double Stance towards Scepticism

2.1 Palamas's Alleged Interpretation of Barlaam's Theological Method as 'Sceptical'

Gregory Palamas (ca. 1296–1357) is well known for his unusually fierce attack on heathen philosophers *en bloc* as 'demon-possessed'.⁴⁰⁶ Still, his ferocity should not be thought to entail that his knowledge of ancient Greek literature was limited or superficial or put only in the service of his attack on heathen philosophy.⁴⁰⁷ As has been shown,⁴⁰⁸ Sextus Empiricus is among the

405 See, e.g., Nicholas Cabasilas, *De vita in Christo* VII, 100–101 in Marie-Hélène Congourdeau, ed., *Nicolas Cabasilas. La Vie en Christ. Livres V–VII* (SC 361; Paris: Cerf, 1990), 212–14.

406 See, e.g., John A. Demetracopoulos, *Is Gregory Palamas an Existentialist? The Restoration of the True Meaning of His Comment on Exodus 3, 14: "Εγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν"* (Athens: Parousia, 1996), 22–25.

407 See John A. Demetracopoulos, "Échos d'Orient – Résonances d'Ouest. In Respect of: Carmelo G. Conticello / Vassa Conticello (eds.), *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, II, XIII^e–XIX^e s.," in *Nicolaus* 37, 2 (2010): 67–148, at 72–73.

408 See John A. Demetracopoulos, *Αὐγουστίνος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμάς: τὰ προβλήματα τῶν ἀριστοτελικῶν κατηγοριῶν καὶ τῆς τριαδικῆς ψυχοθεολογίας* (*Augustine and Gregory Palamas on Aristotle's Categories and the "Vestigia Trinitatis"*) (Athens: Parousia, 1997), 64; 73–77; 199–202. Palamas, in his *Defence of the Holy Hesychasts* III, 1, borrowed Sextus's description of the Stoic distinction between 'natural' or 'indicative' and 'conventional' or 'commemorative sign' in order to describe the divine 'energies' as 'natural signs' of the divine 'essence.' Palamas called a sign of this sort 'φυσικόν,' which, according to Sten Ebbesen, "Greek-Latin Philosophical Interaction" in Ierodiakonou, *Byzantine Philosophy*, 15–30 (= *Greek-Latin Philosophical Interaction. Collected Essays of Sten Ebbesen*, 1 [Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008], item II, 7–19), at 26–27, "takes us back not to Sextus but rather to Augustine, whose distinction between natural and given signs was widely known in Latin Scholasticism." Yet in Sextus, *Adversus Mathematicos* VIII, 201 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 148), Palamas could have read that the indicative sign functions as such 'ἐκ φύσεως,' whereas the commemorative one results from us humans 'θεμένων νόμους,' i.e., it functions as such out of convention. This Sextan wording seems to account sufficiently for Palamas's wording. Besides, although Augustine's distinction between 'signum naturale' and 'signum datum' is pretty close to the Stoic (as well as to the Palamite) distinction just

philosophical authors Palamas read and used. In this, Palamas was no exception amongst his contemporaries.⁴⁰⁹ So, it is no surprise that he was aware

mentioned (see Demetracopoulos, *Αὐγουστῖνος*, 153–54, n. 213), none of the Augustinian works that expound this distinction – *De doctrina Christiana*, *De magistro* and *De dialectica*; see Robert A. Markus, “St. Augustine on Signs,” *Phronesis* 2, 1 (1957): 60–83, at 65–82; Joseph Engels, “La doctrine du signe chez saint Augustin,” *Studia Patristica* 6 (1962): 366–73; Belford Darrell Jackson, “The Theory of Signs in St Augustine’s *De doctrina Christiana*,” *Revue des études augustiniennes* 15 (1969): 9–49; Marc Baratin and François Desbordes, “Sémiologie et métalinguistique chez saint Augustin,” *Langages* 16, 65 (1982): 75–89, at 78–99 and 82–85; Marc Baratin, “Les origines stoïciennes de la théorie augustiniennne du signe,” *Revue des études latines* 59 (1981): 260–68, at 265–66 – was, as far as we know, translated into Greek in Byzantium. On the Augustinian works available to Palamas in some Greek version see, e.g., John A. Demetracopoulos, “Augustine in Byzantium,” in *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy*, 131–33. Augustine’s treatment of language as a sign of thought in the *De Trinitate* (x, 1, 2) was available to Palamas through Maximos Planoudes’s translation (in *Αὐγουστίνου Περὶ Τριάδος βιβλία πεντεκαίδεκα, ἅπερ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετένεγκε Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης. Εἰσαγωγή, ἑλληνικὸ καὶ λατινικὸ κείμενο, γλωσσάριο. Editio princeps*. Ed. Manoles Papathomopoulos, Isabella Tsavari and Gianpaolo Rigotti, 11 [Athens: the Academy of Athens, 1995], 553–59); it does not include the distinction under discussion. As for the hypothesis that some Augustine-based Scholastic source lies behind Palamas’s expression ‘φυσικὸν σύμβολον’, none of the Byzantine translations of Scholastic writings (see a list of these translations in John A. Demetracopoulos, “Latin Philosophical Works Translated into Greek,” in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Robert Pasnau and Christina van Dyke [New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010], 822–26) antedates Palamas’s *Defence of the Holy Hesychasts* III, 1, which was written in 1340; on the date, see Antonis Fyrigos, *Dalla controversia palamitica alla polemica esicastica. Con un’edizione critica delle epistole greche di Barlaam* (Rome: Antonianum 2005), 158–59. So, to conclude, Sextus Empiricus was the only possible source of the content and wording of Palamas’s borrowing of the Stoic theory of signs; besides, since his wording can be traced back even to the occasional Sextan references to this doctrine, such as that in *Adversus Mathematicos* VIII, 201 (see Demetracopoulos, *Αὐγουστῖνος*, 73–74), it seems that Palamas, who had been taught philosophy by Metochites, the first Byzantine philosopher explicitly to rehabilitate Scepticism, knew his Sextus very well.

- 409 Among the Late Byzantine thinkers who directly used Sextus in one way or another are Nicephoros Gregoras, Barlaam the Calabrian, Nicholas Cabasilas, and George Gemistos or Plethon: see John A. Demetracopoulos, “Τὰ προβλήματα τῆς μεθόδου (*modus sciendi*) καὶ τῆς γνωσιμότητος τῶν ὄντων στὴν Νόμων συγγραφὴν τοῦ Γεωργίου Γεμιστοῦ-Πλήθωνος: ἱστορικὴ καὶ κριτικὴ προσέγγιση” (“The Problems of Method (*modus sciendi*) and Degree of Knowledge in Plethon’s *Laws*. An Historical and Critical Approach”), *Νέα κοινωνιολογία* 15, 3 (2002): 41–55, at 54, n. 51; id., *Πλήθων*, 83–87; 110–12; id., “New Evidence on the Ancient, Patristic, and Byzantine Sources of Barlaam the Calabrian’s *Contra Latinos*,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 96, 2 (2003): 83–122, at 101–102, N° 49; cf. *infra*, 420–424. Bessarion did also: see Demetracopoulos, *Πλήθων*, 87–88, n. 217; 113, n. 322.

of the fact that Pyrrhonism or Ephectic philosophy, as depicted in Sextus's writings, challenges every proposition, even the so-called axioms, cancelling from the outset any attempt at edifying demonstrative knowledge on any subject matter.⁴¹⁰

Palamas included Pyrrho's name in the opening words of his description of some Barlaamite-Acindynist's arguments that had launched in a private discussion:

[...] πρὶν ἢ καθίσει διὰ στόματος ἔρρει τὰ τῆς πονηρᾶς ἐνστάσεως ῥήματα, ἦν ἀπὸ τῆς Πύρρωνος ἐφεκτικῆς οὗτοι κακῶς ἐπὶ τὰ θεῖα μετήνεγκαν.⁴¹¹

[...] Even before sitting down, he started spreading out of his mouth the words of the malicious and contentious doctrine, which they transferred from Pyrrho's ephectic to theological discussions.

The *ad loc.* comment by the editor of Palamas's *Epistle* reads:

Palamas's adversaries, by rejecting his distinction between the divine essence, conceived of as inaccessible, and the uncreated energies, conceived of as contacting the created beings, slipped into some sort of theological agnosticism. This is why Palamas holds here that their doctrine is akin to Pyrrhonism.

This explanation is an arbitrary hypothesis, which in fact derives from the obsolete classification of Barlaam's thought as 'theological agnosticism,' allegedly akin to Duns Scotus's drastic shrinking of the range of the *demonstrabilia*.⁴¹² Although this interpretation has found some adherents,⁴¹³ it gravely distorts Barlaam's theological epistemology.⁴¹⁴ Further, the interpretation cannot be justified even in view of what Palamas says here. His lines are just an

410 Gregory Palamas, *1st Epistle to Barlaam* 57, ed. John Meyendorff, in *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ συγγράμματα*, dir. Panagiotes K. Chrestou, I (Thessaloniki: Kyromanos, 1962), 258, 6–14.

411 Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to John Gabras* 2, ed. Nikolaos A. Matsoukas in *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ συγγράμματα*, dir. Panagiotes K. Chrestou, II (Thessaloniki: Kyromanos, 1966; repr. 1994), 326, 2–5. According to its editor, the *Epistle* dates from December 1342 (Matsoukas, op. cit., 285).

412 Giuseppe Schirò, *Barlaam Calabro. Epistole greche. I primordi episodici e dottrinari delle lotte esicaste. Studio introduttivo e testi* (Palermo: Istituto Siciliano di studi bizantini e neo-greci, 1954), 112.

413 See list in Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 178, n. 149.

414 Demetracopoulos, "Thomas Aquinas," 349–51.

unacknowledged yet very close paraphrase of Gregory Nazianzen's metonymical use of 'Pyrrho' (along with the names of many other 'contentious' philosophers) in this passage from *Oration xxxii*:

[...] τὰς Πύρρωνος ἐνστάσεις ἢ ἐφέξεις [...] καὶ τῶν Χρυσίππου συλλογισμῶν τὰς διαλύσεις ἢ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους τεχνῶν τὴν κακοτεχνίαν [...], οἷ' κακῶς εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἡμῶν εἰσέφερησαν.⁴¹⁵

[...] the objections and suspensions of belief after Pyrrho's model [...], and the analysis and refutation of syllogisms after Chrysippus's model, or the damned art of Aristotle's arts [...], which maliciously jumped into our Church.

As has been argued elsewhere,⁴¹⁶ Gregory Nazianzen's words do not form an attack on Pyrrhonian agnosticism or on Ephectic Scepticism (either from a philosophical or from a theological standpoint). Rather, they constitute a condemnation of those bad Christian theologians who would imitate certain philosophers' excessive subtlety and contentiousness (Pyrrho, Aristotle, and Chrysippus being the principal bad examples). Those bad theologians obstinately challenged Orthodox dogma by arguing against what the Church held by virtue of her authority. Therefore, it would be wrong to construe Palamas's passage as anything more than a reproduction of Nazianzen's point. Using 'Pyrrho' in this way, as a metonymical alternative for the vice of contentiousness, with no direct or indirect reference to the philosophical school that Pyrrho had founded, was quite common in Byzantine literature up to Palamas's time and was typically applied to heretics, conceived of as stubborn dissenters.⁴¹⁷

415 Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration xxxii* 25, 2–7 in Moerschini, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours* 32–37, 136–38.

416 Demetracopoulos, "Gregory Nazianzen: Sceptic," 117–126.

417 See, e.g., Nicholas of Methone, *Contra Soterichum Panteugenum* (1156/57; on this date see Athanasios D. Angelou, *Nicholas of Methone. Refutation of Proclus' "Elements of Theology"* [Athens: The Academy of Athens, 1984]: "... ὥσπερ ἄρα καθάπαξ πρὸς πάντα λόγον μάχεσθαι παρασκευασάμενος κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς λεγομένους ἐφεκτικούς, Σέξτον καὶ Πύρρωνα..." (in Andronicus K. Demetrakopoulos, ed., *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica*, 1 [Leipzig: Teubner, 1866; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965], 328). On the stereotypical character of this Byzantine use of Pyrrho's and Sextus's names, see Gerhard Podskalsky, "Nikolaos von Methone und die Proklosrenaissance in Byzanz (11./12. Jh.)," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 42, 2 (1976): 509–23, at 512–13.

This conclusion fully accords with how Palamas depicts⁴¹⁸ the character of the 'heretic' who came to meet him. The heretic initiated the encounter – even insisting that it occur, although it had not been arranged in advance. The disputant was so passionate in his Barlaamite convictions that he started attacking Palamas's theology rudely, even before taking a seat. It was only after Palamas's kind, repeated exhortations to sit down that he finally did so. Further, the 'Barlaamite' had prepared well for the fight; he arrived with a marked-up copy of an anti-Palamite piece by Gregory Acindynos in order to launch arguments against Palamas. The whole scene, in short, depicts perfectly the figure of the contentious Christian theologian who corrupts faith by obstinately and unceasingly arguing against official Church teachings.

So, to conclude and to clear the ground for a solid investigation into Palamas's stance toward the ancient philosophical trend of Scepticism and its Christian reception: there is nothing philosophically or theologically interesting in the use of Pyrrho's name by Gregory Palamas.⁴¹⁹ To see what position Palamas did hold on Scepticism, we must turn to some of his other writings.

2.2 Palamas's Rejection of Scepticism as 'atheism'

Palamas's *Epistle to the Monk Dionysius* (written in spring or summer of 1344)⁴²⁰ is a peculiar attack on the Acindynists. Palamas tries to show that the fundamental errors of the Acindynists can be traced back to some fundamental errors of heathen philosophy and some ancient Christian heresies. To make

418 Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to John Gabras* 2–3, in Matsoukas, *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ συγγράμματα*, II, 325, 16–326, 26.

419 Lawrence P. Schrenk, "Augustine's *De Trinitate* in Byzantine Skepticism," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 30 (1989): 451–56, at 455–56, also over-invested in Palamas's *Epistle to Gabras*. Relying on a translation of and a comment on the above-quoted lines from this Palamite *Epistle* provided by Ihor Ševčenko, "Nikolaus Cabasilas' Correspondence and the Treatment of Late Byzantine Literary Texts," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 47 (1954): 49–59, at 51, Schrenk laments that "it is unfortunate that we lack the specific arguments of this unnamed opponent [i.e. the follower of Acindynos who is reported to have held a discussion with Palamas], for of all these men this interlocutor of Palamas seems to have been the most philosophical in that he applied the skeptical methodology to the theological arguments of the current concern." As shown here, this is a completely misleading approach to Palamas's lines. An assessment of Schrenk's approach to the place of Scepticism and anti-Scepticism in Late Byzantine thought in general is offered in Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 82–88; 309–11.

420 See Matsoukas, introduction to his edition of Palamas's *Epistles* (except those addressed to Barlaam and Gregory Acindynos), in *Γρηγορίου*, II, 297. Note that the editor's division of Palamas's epistle into paragraphs is not helpful.

this argument, he classifies those errors and heresies into three 'genera of atheism' (or 'godlessness'), i.e., three sorts of doctrines that fail, in one or another respect, to provide man with true ideas of God:

(A) 'Hellenism,' subdivided into:

- (1) professed atheism, such as Epicurus's doctrine, whose moral ideal was as base as bodily pleasure;
- (2) materialism, such as that held by the Ionian cosmologists, who deified (i.e., posed as principles of the universe) this or that of the four natural elements or a combination of them;
- (3) Dogmatic and Ephectic Scepticism;
- (4) errant theism, such as that produced by Socrates, Plato, and their followers, who managed to supersede atheism and materialism by believing in some kind of God, but formed so completely wrong a concept of Him, that their failure was as pernicious as materialism.⁴²¹

(B) 'Heresy,' which is subdivided into:

- (1) errant monotheists (apparently including Hebrews, but also probably Muslims),⁴²² who believe in God the Father but deprive Him of His Son even after the very Incarnation of the Son;
- (2) errant monotheists, who speak of the Son of God and admit that He is God yet in a wrong way, mistaking Him as the same person as the Father (Sabellians); and
- (3) errant monotheists, who believe in the Son of God as well as the Holy Spirit yet mistake both as creatures of God (Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius etc.).⁴²³

(C) practitioners of distorted piety or 'superstition,' who have excessive convictions about the superiority of God, and consequently are reluctant to hold, preach, and defend the right beliefs on Him with firmness.⁴²⁴

421 Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to the Monk Dionysius* 1, in Matsoukas, 479, 1–480, 2.

422 Palamas argued for the triunity of God in his discussions with some Muslims (see *infra*, 408).

423 Op. cit. 3 in Matsoukas, op. cit., 481, 9–23. On calling heretics 'atheists' or 'godless,' see Pseudo-Athanasius of Alexandria. *Sermo in annuntiationem Deiparae*: "τοῖς ἀθέοις αἰρετικοῖς" (PG 28, 932C), by contrast to the "οἱ παρ' Ἑλλήσι λεχθέντες ἄθεοι" in Athanasius of Alexandria, *De synodis Arimini in Italia* 35, 1 (PG 26, 753B).

424 Op. cit. 5–6, in Matsoukas, op. cit., 482, 19–484, 3. Since Palamas, in the *Epistle* under discussion here, quotes two passages from this pseudo-Athanasian sermon (*Epistle to the Monk Dionysius* 6 and 10, in Matsoukas, op. cit., 483, 30–484, 3 and 488, 3–5), it can be taken for granted that Pseudo-Athanasius is the source of Palamas's calling the heretics 'atheists.'

Scepticism is treated in (A), and one might suspect that it is implicitly treated in (C), too. Palamas's description of and distinction between (A₁) and (A₂) is a succinct reproduction of Clement's well-known description of the various sorts of 'atheism' of the Greek 'philosophers' in Books v and vi of the *Protrepticus*.⁴²⁵ What Palamas added to Clement's list is Scepticism (A₃):

Οἱ δὲ καὶ τῶν ὄντων πάντων ἀκαταληψίαν ἐδογμάτισαν εἶναι πᾶσι παντελῇ, καθάπερ Ξενοφάνης Κολοφώνιος εἰπών· “οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν οἶδεν, δόκος δ’ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται”. Εἰσὶ δ’ οἱ καὶ πρὸς τὸ δοκοῦν ἀξιοῦσιν ἀντιλέγειν ἀεὶ, Σέξτοι καὶ Πύρρωνες οὗτοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἐφεκτικοὶ καλούμενοι.

The doctrine of some others was the absolute incomprehensibility [of everything] for all men, e.g., the doctrine of Xenophanes of Colophon, who said: “Nobody knows anything, but opinion is allotted to all.” Further, there are also some who are determined to constantly contradict even mere opinions, namely, those Sextuses and Pyrrhos and all those who are called ‘Ephectics.’

Clement did not include any information on Xenophanes's scepticism in his writings. It seems that Palamas was led to Xenophanes's B₃₄ as follows. Clement's *Protrepticus*, which was Palamas's basic source, mentions Metrodorus amongst those who held some sort of materialistic explanation of the world, along with Anaximander, Anaxagoras, Archelaus, Leucippus,

425 Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* v–vi, in Claude Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Le Protreptique* (SC 2; Paris: Cerf, 1949), 127–37 = Miroslav Marcovich, *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus* [Leiden: Brill, 1995], 97–109; see especially v, 64, 3 (in Mondésert, 127 = Marcovich, 97, 13): “Ἀθεοὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ οὗτοι, σοφίᾳ τινὶ ἀσφόω...” etc.; v, 66, 1 (in Mondésert, 130 = Marcovich, 100, 1–2): “Τῶν δὲ ἄλλων φιλοσόφων ὅσοι τὰ στοιχεῖα ὑπερβάντες ἐπολυπραγμότησαν τι ὑψηλότερον καὶ περιττότερον...” etc. True, whereas Clement distinguishes between those who held a material-element theory and those who offered a metaphysical explanation of the world (e.g., infinite intellect *et sim.*), Palamas distinguishes between all of those on the one hand and Socrates and Plato on the other. Still, the criterion of the distinction is partly identical. For Palamas's negative reference to Epicurus, see Clement of Alexandria's bitter repudiation of Epicurus's 'impiety' in v, 66, 5 (in Mondésert, 131 = Marcovich, 101, 7–8). Most of the few footnotes on Palamas's sources that accompany the edition of his writings are insufficient and/or misleading. On the doxographical background to Clement's *Protrepticus* v–vi see the *Forschungsbericht* by Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, “The *Protrepticus* of Clement of Alexandria: a Commentary,” Doct. diss., University of Bologna, 2008. (http://amsdottorato.cib.unibo.it/1117/1/Tesi_Herrero_de_Jauregui_Miguel.pdf; accessed August 5, 2012), 193.

Democritus, Alcmaeon and others. Palamas mentions Empedocles, Heraclitus, Anaximenes, and Democritus. Still, upon reading Metrodorus's name, he probably recalled a doxographical passage from Aristocles's *On Philosophy*, preserved in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Praeparatio evangelica* XIV, 9, 8: ... Τὸν μὲν οὖν Μητροδωρον [...]. Γράφων γέ τοι *Περὶ φύσεως* εἰσβολῇ ἐχρήσατο τοιαύτη· 'Οὐδείς ἡμῶν οὐδὲν οἶδεν, οὐδ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο, πότερον οἶδαμεν ἢ οὐκ οἶδαμεν' ... (see full passage *supra*, 274).⁴²⁶ Of course, we cannot exclude the possibility that Palamas had noticed the mingling of Xenophanes's and Metrodorus's dicta in Epiphanius's *Adversus haereses* (see *supra*, 274). It was presumably this explicit connection of Metrodorus's epistemology to Pyrrhonism that led Palamas to reproduce without acknowledgment yet almost verbatim Metrodorus's declaration that οὐδείς [...] οὐδὲν οἶδεν. As for quoting Xenophanes's B34, Palamas drew on the *Refutatio omnium haeresium* of Hippolytus (*ob.* 235 AD).⁴²⁷

Ξενοφάνης [...] ἔφη πρῶτος⁴²⁸ ἀκαταληψίαν εἶναι πάντων, εἰπὼν οὕτως· "εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα τύχη τετελεσμένον εἰπών, αὐτὸς ὅμως οὐκ οἶδε· δόκος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται".

Xenophanes [...] first asserted that there is no possibility of comprehending anything, expressing himself thus: "For even if, in the best case, one happened to speak just what the case is, still he himself would not know; but opinion is allotted to all".⁴²⁹

426 I omit lines 9–11 in Diels and Kranz's edition, which form a restitution based on Cicero's *Academica* (see *infra*, n. 429), which was not, of course, available to Palamas.

427 Demetracopoulos, *Αἰγιστίνο*, 150, n. 197.

428 Cf. Arius Didymus: "Ξενοφάνους πρῶτου λόγος ἦλθεν εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας..." (see *supra*, 283); Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* VIII, 326: "Καὶ τοῦτο πρῶτον εἶπε Ξενοφάνης..." (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 178); Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* IX, 20: "Φησὶ δὲ Σωτίων πρῶτον αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν ἀκατάληπτα εἶναι τὰ πάντα, πλανώμενος" in Marcovich, *Diogenes Laertii*, 644, 17–18 = Fritz Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Suppl. I: *Hermippus der Kallimacheer*. Suppl. II: *Sotion* (Basel: Schwabe, 1974 and 1978), 28, 21–22, fr. 29; "Sotion says that he was the first to maintain that all things are incognizable, but Sotion is in error" (tr. Hicks, *Diogenes*, II, 429). None of these authors' wording is closer to Palamas's than Hippolytus's.

429 Hippolytus of Rome, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* I, 14, 1, in Miroslav Marcovich, *Hippolytus. Refutatio omnium haeresium* (PTS 25; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986), 73; tr. John Henry Macmahon, in Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and Arthur Cleveland Coxe, dir., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, v, *Hippolytus, Cyprian, Caius, Novatian* (New York: Scribners, 1886), 32, except for Xenophanes's lines, for which see above, 248–250. The unknown source of Hippolytus's assertion that Xenophanes held a thorough incomprehensibility is plausibly paralleled with Cicero's testimony that Parmenides and Xenophanes "incomprehend

Palamas, unlike Metrodorus in Aristocles *apud* Eusebius (see *supra*, 274), construed Xenophanes's ἐπὶ πᾶσι correctly, i.e., as meaning 'to all men' (on this interpretation see *supra*, 248–250): as πάντων refers to the objects of knowledge (τῶν ὄντων πάντων), πᾶσι cannot but refer to the would-be knowers. Further, since Palamas had read and used Sextus Empiricus's writings (see *supra*, 363), it can plausibly be assumed that he knew of the fullest extant version of B34 preserved in Sextus.⁴³⁰ Nonetheless, Palamas replaced three and a half of the verses of the fragment with Metrodorus's οὐδείς οὐδὲν οἶδεν. This replacement, which was probably done in part for brevity's sake,⁴³¹ suggests that Palamas felt that such an abridgment of B34 was quite legitimate, for Metrodorus's argument on behalf of extreme epistemological nihilism was that man is ignorant even of the very possibility or impossibility of knowing anything, and it is that point which seems to be the core of Xenophanes's argument (v. 4: αὐτὸς ὅμως οὐκ οἶδε; cf. *supra*, 247). This mingling of the two fragments shows that Palamas shared Metrodorus's interpretation of B34. Besides, such an interpretation was available to him in Sextus Empiricus (cf. *supra*, 298). Further, as has been convincingly argued, Epiphanius's version of B34 is "the result of some sort of doxographical contamination" which amplified the meaning of scepticism declared in the beginning of the version by

eorum adrogantiam quasi irati, qui, cum sciri nihil possit, audeant se scire dicere" / "... inveigh almost angrily against the arrogance of those who dare to say that they know, whereas nothing can be known" (*Academica* II, 23, 74 = Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, I, A25, 116,13–15; tr. Harris Rackham, *Cicero in Twenty-Eight Volumes*, XIX, *De Natura Deorum. Academica* [Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1979; 1933], 561, slightly emended; cf. Wyss, "Akademie, Akademiker," 67–68). This seems to me more plausible than placing the source of Hippolytus 'within the Sceptical tradition' (Jørgen Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background* [Wiesbaden: Marix, 1978], 84; Catherine Osborne, *Rethinking Early Greek Philosophy: Hippolytus of Rome and the Presocratics* [London: Cornell University Press, 1987], 209, n. 20), unless by 'Sceptical' one means 'Academic.' Even more, according to Brunschwig's admirably careful and lucid analysis of the extant versions of Metrodorus's fragment ("Le fragment DK 70 B 1"), Cicero's version must be the closest of all to Metrodorus's lost *ipsissima verba*. Another possible source for Palamas's description of Xenophanes as an apologist of the incomprehensibility of everything is in principle Diogenes Laertius's *Vitae philosophorum* IX, 20 (see *supra*, n. 428) and Sextus Empiricus's *Adversus Mathematicos* VII, 49 ("Ξενοφάνης μὲν κατὰ τινὰς εἰπὼν πάντα ἀκατάληπτα..." in Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 12). Still, Laertius says that this view about Xenophanes is wrong, whereas the verbal similarities between Palamas and Hippolytus are stronger than between Palamas and Sextus.

430 See Demetracopoulos, *Αἰγυσιπότης*, 65–69.

431 Op. cit., 67.

developing arguments more or less directly inspired by the B34 itself.⁴³² Palamas's deliberate stitching-together of Metrodorus's and Xenophanes's sentences suggests that he was aware of this, even if what is carefully described today as 'contamination' seemed to him to be a real convergence or even coincidence between Xenophanes's and Metrodorus's epistemological doctrines, which, as has been seen (275), is probably not far away from how Metrodorus himself viewed Xenophanes's B34.

Moreover, in Aristocles's passage as quoted by Eusebius, Metrodorus's Scepticism is presented as going hand in hand with Protagoras's agnosticism; Metrodorus's statement that πάντα ἐστίν, ὃ ἄν τις νοήσαι sounds as if it were a version of Protagoras's πᾶσα φαντασία ἐστὶν ἀληθής (fr. A15)⁴³³ and the *homo mensura* maxim (fr. A13; A14; B1).⁴³⁴ This pairing might suggest that Palamas also believed that Xenophanes's Scepticism and Protagoras's agnosticism were very close to each other in confining human knowledge to the strict limits of the individual being.

Now, what about (C)? In it, Palamas castigates what he believes to be a distorted kind of piety, i.e., superstition. He does so by quoting the following lines from Synesius of Cyrene (ca. 365/70–413/4 AD):

“Εγὼ δὲ τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν ἀξιῶ διαστέλλειν ἀπὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας. κακία γάρ ἐστιν ἄρετῆς προσωπεῖον”⁴³⁵ περικειμένη, ἣν φιλοσοφία τὸ τρίτον οὐσαν τῆς ἀθεΐας εἶδος ἐφώρασεν”.⁴³⁶

432 Brunschwig, “Le fragment DK 70 B 1,” 24–25. Brunschwig elaborates on Jaap Mansfeld's analysis of Hippolytus's doxographical material on Xenophanes and Metrodorus; see Jaap Mansfeld, *Heresiography in Context: Hippolytus' 'Elenchos' as a Source for Greek Philosophy* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 32–36.

433 Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente*, II, 258, 38.

434 This interpretation of Metrodorus's statement has been challenged so as to make it compatible with his Atomistic identity: see Matteo Andolfo, *Atomisti antichi. Testimonianze e frammenti secondo la raccolta di H. Diels e W. Kranz* (Milan: Rusconi, 1999), 523–24, n. 167. Its translation as “esiste tutto ciò che si conosce” (Andolfo, op. cit., 423) is syntactically impossible to me. Still, even if I am wrong, the possibility that Palamas construed the whole passage as Sceptical remains.

435 Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *De professione Christiana* in Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, VIII, Part I (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 133, 13–15: “τὸ τῆς σωφροσύνης ἢ τὸ τῆς πραότητος ἢ τινος ἄλλης ἀρετῆς προσωπεῖον”.

436 Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to the Monk Dionysius* 6 in Matsoukas, op. cit., 483, 20–23; Synesius of Cyrene, *Epistle 66* in Antonius Garzya, ed., *Synesii Cyrenensis epistolae* (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico, 1979), 113, 16–19. In the edition of Palamas's epistle (Matsoukas, 483, note 2), Synesius's passage is declared ‘locus non inventus.’

I wish to separate superstition from piety, for it is an evil which has taken the mask of virtue, an evil which philosophy has discovered to be the third sort of godlessness.⁴³⁷

According to Palamas's *ad hoc* comment, this sort of godlessness is τὸ δι' ἀλόγιστον δέος παραιτεῖσθαι τι λέγειν ἢ πράττειν, καὶ ταῦτα χρείας καλούσης, τῶν δεδωγμένων περὶ Θεοῦ⁴³⁸ ("to abstain, out of fearful caution and reverence, and in spite of it being necessary to intervene, from saying or doing any of those things that have been officially sanctioned as being right about God"). As Palamas explains at length,⁴³⁹ this reluctance takes the form of refusing to elaborate the traditional *littera* of the true conceptions of God or to draw even the most obviously safe conclusions from them. If Palamas thought that Barlaam and Acindynos held some form of theological agnosticism that prevented them from accepting his doctrine of the divine 'energies' conceived of as the divine level accessible to man, he would have said so explicitly right here, i.e., in the context of drawing parallels between Barlaam's and Acindynos's thought and the various sorts of 'atheism.' He did not do that, however. He simply says that a good theologian should not be so stubbornly stuck on the traditional wording of revealed truth that he fears re-phrasing the core of that truth in order to make it clear in the intellectual and spiritual circumstances of his own age. This injunction is far from any sort of condemnation of theological agnosticism.

Now, the *loci communes* from Gregory of Nyssa and Plutarch that figure in the *apparatus fontium* in the critical edition of Synesius's *Letters* can account only for some elements of the wording of Synesius's passage. There are other sources to seek. What about Synesius's idea (and its wording, of course) that superstition is the third kind of atheism? For this, we must have direct recourse to Philo of Alexandria:

Τὸ δ' ὅτι [God] ἔστιν [...], οὐ πάντες [...] καταλαμβάνουσιν· ἀλλ' (1) οἱ μὲν ἀντικρυς ἀπεφάνησαντο μηδὲν εἶναι τὸ θεῖον,⁴⁴⁰ (2) οἱ δὲ ἐνεδοίασαν

437 Tr. Augustine FitzGerald, *The Letters of Synesius of Cyrene* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1926), 155, slightly altered.

438 Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to the Monk Dionysius* 6, in Matsoukas, op. cit., 483, 23–26.

439 Id., op. cit. 9; 12–13; 14, in Matsoukas, op. cit., 486, 6–30; 489, 29–491, 5; 492, 24–26.

440 For Philo, this is the worst vice (Philo of Alexandria, *De specialibus legibus* 1, 32; Cohn, *Philonis*, v, 8, 20). Cf. Plato, *Leges* 888A–C.

ἐπαμφοτερίσαντες ὡς “οὐκ ἔχοντες” εἰπεῖν, εἴτε “ἔστιν” εἴτε μὴ,⁴⁴¹ (3) οἱ δὲ καὶ ἔθει μᾶλλον ἢ λογισμῷ τὰς περὶ ὑπάρξεως Θεοῦ κομίσαντες ἐννοίας παρὰ τῶν τρεφόντων ἔδοξαν εὐστόχως εὐσεβεῖν δεισιδαιμονίᾳ τὴν εὐσέβειαν χαράξαντες.

Now the fact that He is [...] is not apprehended by all. [...] Some distinctly deny that there is such a thing as the Godhead. Others hesitate or fluctuate as though ‘unable to state’ whether there is or not. Others whose notions about the subsistence of God are derived through habit rather than thinking from those who brought them up, believe themselves to have successfully attained to religion yet have left on it the imprint of superstition.⁴⁴²

441 This clearly echoes Protagoras’s fr. B4 (cf. *supra*, 254). Cf. Philo’s description of Protagoras’s *homo-mensura* maxim as ‘impiety’ (*De posteritate Caini* 35 in Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, II, 8, 35–9, 1).

442 Philo of Alexandria, *De praemiis et poenis* 40 (Cohn, *Philonis*, v, 344, 19–345, 3); tr. Francis Henry Colson, *Philo in Ten Volumes*, VIII (Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1939; ⁶1989), 335. In light of Gregory Nazianzen’s latent assimilation of this paragraph, I would be inclined to translate the Philonic phrase “δεισιδαιμονίᾳ τὴν εὐσέβειαν χαράξαντες” as “they formed their religious conscience by means of superstition.” On irrationality as a constitutive element of superstition (by contrast to sane piety), see also Philo of Alexandria’s *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* 18 (Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, I, 262, 17–19). Philo’s tripartite division of atheism was probably a borrowing from or a slight elaboration of a relevant material produced in the 1st century AD or even earlier. For instance, this is the classification of the various sorts of atheists given by Philodemus of Gadara (ca. 110–ca. 35 BC): “(I) Those who say that it is unknown whether there are any gods or what they are like” (“τοὺς ἄγνωστον εἶ τινές εἰσι θεοὶ λέγοντες ἢ ποιοὶ τινές εἰσιν”); (II) “those who say openly that the gods do not exist” (“τοὺς διαρρήδην ὅτι οὐκ εἰσιν ἀποφαινομένους”); (III) “those who clearly imply it” (“φανεροὺς ὄντας ὡς ἀνήρουν”) (*On Piety*, P. Herc. 1428, cols. 14, 32–15, 8; see Dirk Obbink, *Philodemus. On Piety. Part I* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996], 1–2; cf. Jan N. Bremmer, “Atheism in Antiquity,” in *Cambridge Companion to Atheism*, ed. Michael Martin [New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006], 11–26, at 12). (I) is a literal reproduction of the Protagorean atheism, which fully (even literally) coincides with N° 2 in Philo’s classification. (II) is Philo’s N° 1, almost verbatim. (III) must be a reference to the implicit atheism of Epicurus (see Obbink, op. cit., 2–3). Yet Philo’s description of superstition as a form of atheism cannot be reduced to Philodemus’s classification of atheism. Whether it was borrowed from somewhere or not, I cannot see. Still, it is highly probable that Philo’s classification had some antecedents, given that several specific treatises on the topic of religion, piety, and gods had been produced already from the time of Protagoras down to Philo’s time (see Obbink, op. cit., 82–83). Further, in Diogenes of Oenoanda’s (probably late 2nd century AD) *Περὶ αἰσθήσεως καὶ φύσεως ἐπιτομή* (fr. 16; in Martin Ferguson Smith, *The Epicurean Inscription* [Naples: Bibliopolis, 1993], 174–76; see also 131), Diagoras of Melos is mentioned as a case of declared atheism (“ἄντικρυς εἶπε μὴ

Philo classifies the stance of those who 'have not discovered' 'that God exists' (i.e. the atheists) into three sorts:

- (1) Declared atheism: some persons explicitly deny the existence of God and grant their denial certainty.
- (2) Agnosticism of the Protagorean and Ephectic type: other persons, if asked whether God exists or not, declare that they can vote neither for the positive nor for the negative, thus suspending judgement.
- (3) Others, although exhibiting some 'piety' by embracing the traditional religious beliefs of their community, do not hold them as rationally elaborated religious beliefs, but by mere habit; therefore, they cannot be taken as really accepting the existence of God. They regard their piety, which consists in the exact reproduction of what they have been told by their *majores*, as 'hitting the mark' or 'correct' (εὐστόχως). In fact, their piety is badly impaired by their irrationality and so remains just a 'superstition' (δαισιδαίμονία). Despite some apparently strong but actually quite illusive appearances, it does not exceed the level of atheism.⁴⁴³

εἶναι θεούς"), which is Philo's Category I, and Protagoras is mentioned as a case of real yet verbally dissimulated atheism ("τῇ μὲν δυνάμει τὴν αὐτὴν ἦνεγκε Διαγόρα δόξαν, ταῖς λέξεσιν δὲ ἐτέραις ἐχρήσατο, ὥς τὸ λίαν ἱταμὸν αὐτῆς ἐκφευξούμενος. Ἐφησε γὰρ 'μὴ εἰδέναι εἰ θεοὶ εἰσιν' [Protagoras, fr. B4, l. 1: "Περὶ μὲν θεῶν οὐκ ἔχω εἰδέναι"; cf. *supra*, 254]- τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν τὸ αὐτὸ τῷ λέγειν εἰδέναι ὅτι μὴ εἰσιν"), which is close to Philo's Category II, whereas we cannot know if Diogenes's text, which stops so abruptly, included any further category such as 'superstition'; indeed, even the description of Category II is mutilated. – For a near-complete list of occurrences of the lexeme of δαισιδαίμονία in Philo's writings see Peter John Koets, *Δαισιδαίμονία. A Contribution to the Knowledge of the Religious Terminology in Greek* (Purmerend: Muusses, 1929), 47–50.

- 443 Philo, by drawing (presumably on the basis of some previous thinkers) such a clear and sophisticated distinction between piety and superstition and bringing the latter close to atheism, has taken precedence to the point of Plutarch (*De superstitione* 164F; 171E; *De Iside et Osiride* 355D; 378A) that superstition should not be confused with piety because it is as bad as, if not worse than, atheism (see also Philo of Alexandria, *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* 24, in Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, I, 263, 24–25; id., *Quod Deus sit immutabilis* 103 and 163–64, in Wendland, *Philonis*, II, 78, 16–17; 90, 20–21; id., *De specialibus legibus* IV, 147, in Cohn, *Philonis*, V, 242, 4–10). On the negative character of superstition in Philo (both superstition in general and in regard to using names to describe the divine things), see Marie-Joseph Rondeau, "Πραγματολογεῖν: pour éclairer Philon, *Fug.* 54 et *Somn.* I, 230," in *Ἀλεξανδρινά: hellénisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie. Mélanges offerts au P. Claude Mondésert* (Paris: Cerf, 1987), 121–50, at 135–42.

Now, Synesius applies this classification to the behaviour of some actual Christians, who happened to react superstitiously to the desecration of a small private house that they had used as a church.⁴⁴⁴ Synesius's application of Philo's description of superstition as atheism may seem somewhat tendentious, yet it is not. For, as Synesius argues, the Christians' obstinate reaction to the desecration was based on a false belief about God, i.e., that God's nature allows for a mechanistic grace, one that can be procured by means of some traditional 'sacred matter' and 'sounds.'⁴⁴⁵

The fact that a Christian author of the 4th–5th centuries silently and positively quoted Philo is not, of course, a surprise.⁴⁴⁶ It is impressive, however, that Palamas had detected Synesius's source. As has been seen (369–375 above), Palamas's description of 'Hellenic' atheism (Category A) is mainly based on Clement's *Protrepticus* v–vi, with the exception of Sub-category (A₃), i.e., Scepticism, which is exactly Philo's Category (2). As we now see, Clement's mention of Metrodorus can account, in the way explained above (371–372), for the content of Palamas's description of Sub-category (A₃); but his very decision to include such a Sub-category in Category (A) can obviously be reduced to Philo's inclusion of Scepticism as a sort of atheism. Even more, Palamas's tripartite division of atheism is just a modified version of Philo's corresponding division of atheists. Even the phrasing is blatantly shared, although it is obvious that Palamas deliberately substituted synonyms for some of Philo's words (compare, e.g., Philo's οἱ μὲν ἄντικρυς ἀπεφάνησαντο μηδ' ὅλως εἶναι τὸ θεῖον to Palamas's οἱ μὲν μηδαμῇ μηδαμῶς εἶναι θεὸν ἐνόμισαν).⁴⁴⁷ Thus Palamas, although

444 Synesius of Cyrene, *Epistle* 66, in Garzya, *Synesii*, 111, 14–113, 5.

445 Garzya, *Synesii*, 116, 1–6; tr. FitzGerald, *The Letters*, 155. Cf. Philo's remark that true religioners practise piety 'μετὰ ἀτυφίας' ('in freedom from arrogance'), whereas, to the 'superstitious men' ('δεισιδαίμονες'), piety consists in "τύφῳ ῥημάτων καὶ ὀνομάτων γλισχρότητι καὶ τερβρείαις ἐθῶν" ("in simplicity of heart practise the piety which is true and genuine, free from all tawdry ornament") (Philo of Alexandria, *De Cherubim* 42; in Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, I, 180, 8–20; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, II, 35), which is very close to impiety ("δεισιδαιμονίαν [...] πρᾶγμα ἀδελφὸν ἀσεβείᾳ") and is implanted in the soul by one's social environment (Philo of Alexandria, *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* 15, in Cohn and Wendland, op. cit., 207, 15–17). Incidentally, Synesius, by ascribing the unmasking ('ἐφώρασε') of the atheistic character of superstition to 'philosophy' ('φιλοσοφία'), did not imply that this was a philosophical doctrine (in contrast to theological and religious one); rather, he merely meant 'truth has shown us that ...'.

446 See, e.g., Runia, *Philo and the Church Fathers*, 232–37.

447 Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to the Monk Dionysius* 1, in Matsoukas, 479, 5–6. It would be quite interesting to check if these slight verbal changes, discernible in most of Palamas's latent integrations of passages from non-Christian or non-saintly Christian authors to his

he explicitly and emphatically ascribes the classification of superstition as the third and last sort of atheism corresponding to Synesius's 'plenitude of wisdom' (περιουσία σοφίας),⁴⁴⁸ was fully aware of Synesius's direct source, since he himself had used this source shortly earlier in the very same composition. Presumably, Palamas, although he had silently used Philo's *œuvre* more than once in his own writings,⁴⁴⁹ preferred in this instance to let Philo's description of superstition as 'godlessness' go forth under a Christian's name.

writings, reflect his stylistic preferences or not. More light will be shed on that question by figuring out his practice with explicit and unacknowledged quotations from the Christian *auctoritates*. If the changes do not reflect Palamas's stylistic preferences, then perhaps they reflect his wish to leave as little trace as possible of his non-Christian borrowings. To my knowledge, no stylometric study of Palamas's writings has yet been undertaken.

448 Id., op. cit. 6, in Matsoukas, 483, 18–19. Palamas obviously plays with Synesius's name (deriving from σύνεσις, a synonym for wisdom). Further, he pompously exalts him as “ὁ τοῦς τῆς Κυρήνης ἀρχιερατικοὺς ὄϊακας ἐγκεχειρισμένος” (“[...] who was granted the steering-wheel of the archiepiscopal see of Cyrene”). Here Palamas probably reproduces Photius's *Bibliotheca* 26 (in René Henry, *Photius. Bibliothèque*, 1 [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1959], 15–16 = Immanuel Bekker, *Photii Constantinopolitani Bibliotheca*, 1 [Berlin: Reimer, 1824], 5b39 and 6a2): “ἀρχιερωσύνης ἡξίωσαν [...] ἀρχιεράτευσεν [...] ἐπεκόσμηκε δὲ Κυρήνην...”). All of this makes the reader concentrate on the person of Synesius and not even think about the possibility that there might be any other authority behind the doctrine of superstition that Palamas avers.

449 John A. Demetracopoulos, “Palamas Transformed. Palamite Interpretations of the Distinction between God's 'Essence' and 'Energies' in Late Byzantium,” in *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*, ed. Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 263–372, at 355, n. 287. Palamas assimilated Philo's sequence, too, although in his own way. Philo goes on to say that some people did discover that God exists, is the creator of the world, and rules it through His providence by carefully observing the order and the beauty of the sensible world (*De praemiis et poenis* 41 and 43; in Cohn, *Philonis*, v, 345, 3–4 and 345, 20: “... δι’ ἐπιστήμης ἰσχυσαν φαντασιωθῆναι ‘τὸν ποιητὴν καὶ ἡγεμόνα ‘τοῦ παντός’ [Plato, *Timaeus* 28C3–4] [...] Εἰκότι λογισμῷ στοχασάμενοι τὸν δημιουργόν”). Although Philo regards this mediate sort of knowledge of the divine as inferior to direct knowledge of God (op. cit. 43–46, in Cohn, op. cit., 345, 20–346, 14; see also *Legum allegoriae* III, 100–103, in Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, I, 135, 13–136, 6), he does not repudiate it. Palamas, for his part, concedes that some people – he mentions Socrates, Plato and their followers – conceived of a being superior to the sensible world, yet their conception was absolutely wrong (*Epistle to the Monk Dionysius* 1; in Matsoukas, op. cit., 479, 18–480, 2: “ἐφ’ ἀντάσθησαν μὲν Θεόν, ἀλλὰ λίαν ἀμυδρῶς, παντάπασιν ἄσυστάτους δόξας περὶ αὐτοῦ συγγραψάμενοι”). Apparently, Palamas implicitly yet clearly abstained from subscribing to Philo's positive view of the pagans' natural theology, voting instead for Clement of Alexandria's emphatically negative view of pagan philosophy, including Plato's. As for the reason why Palamas selected Socrates and Plato as the

What about the appropriateness of Palamas's silent appropriation of this Philonic element? Philo blames superstitious people for blindly and irrationally holding certain convictions about God. Yet how is it possible for a person to have irrational beliefs, strictly speaking? One must at least understand the content of the beliefs; if not, then declaring one's piety amounts to reverence for mere words which, as Philo explains later on in the same text, is quite absurd.⁴⁵⁰ Since Palamas's concern was about beliefs concerning God, whereas Synesius's concern was about religious and ecclesiastical practice, Palamas made explicit what was implicit in Philo's general description of superstition, namely, that superstition may regard either λέγειν or πράττειν (see *supra*, 373). Thus he made his case about his adversaries' superstitious defence of the *littera* of the Christian tradition perfectly clear: Synesius had combatted superstition of 'deeds,' whereas Palamas was combatting a superstition that had to do with 'λέγειν'.⁴⁵¹

representatives of this sort of inadequate speech about God, he presumably did so because he noticed that Philo, in his description of this trend, paraphrased some celebrated words of Socrates's *persona* in Plato's *Timaeus*, words that Clement quotes in Books v–vi of the *Protrepticus* (vi, 68, 1 in Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Le Protreptique*, 133 = Marcovich, *Clementis*, 103, 3–5), which, as has been shown (see *supra*, 368–372), lies behind the entire Palamite description of pagan 'atheism.' To Palamas, Socrates's and Plato's 'wisdom' falls under what St. Paul (1 Cor. 1:20) calls 'folly' (*First Epistle to Barlaam* 38, in John Meyendorff, ed., *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμά συγγράμματα*, Panagiotes K. Chrestou, dir., 1 [Thessaloniki: Kyromanos, 1960], 247, 10–17); Palamas tries to show that Socrates as well as some members of his school (e.g., Plotinus and Proclus) were demon-possessed (Gregory Palamas, *1st Epistle to Barlaam* 46–47, in Chrestou, op. cit., 252, 6–253, 11; id., *Triads* 1, 1, 15, in Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμά συγγράμματα*, 1, 378, 23–26). As for Plato, Palamas argues that the cosmology of the *Timaeus* was dictated by demons (ibid., 378, 14–24). Cf. Demetracopoulos, *Is Gregory Palamas*, 23–25; id., "Late Byzantine Cosmology. Gregory Palamas' Critique of the Doctrine of Plotinus and Proclus of the 'World Soul' (Part 1)" (in Modern Greek), *Φιλοσοφία* 31 (2001): 175–91, at 187. Still, even this absolutely negative evaluation of the pagan demonstration of the existence of the divine on the basis of the order of the universe has its roots in Philo, too; for, to Philo, as to Palamas, this way of searching into God led many pagan thinkers to errant ideas about the divine nature. See, e.g., Philo of Alexandria, *De migratione Abrahami* 178–95, in Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis*, 11, 303, 5–306, 19; cf. James K. Fiebleman, *Religious Platonism: The Influence of Religion on Plato and the Influence of Plato on Religion* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1959), 119. This idea of pagan errancy occurs in some Palamite authors, too. See, e.g., Philotheos Kokkinos, *De Domini luce* 1 in Petya Yaneva, *Philotheos Kokkinos. De Domini luce. Editio princeps* (with a Bulgarian Introduction) (Sofia: Istok-Zapad, 2011), 53, 24–54, 4.

450 Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to the Monk Dionysius* 9, in Matsoukas, op. cit., 486, 25–30.

451 Beliefs and deeds are just two aspects of the same thing in the ancient discussions of superstition, e.g., in Clement of Alexandria. See George Karamanolis, "Clement on

Last but not least, Palamas imputes to his adversaries an ‘unwise fear’ (ἀλόγιστον δέος) of God or ‘impious piety’ (ἀνευλαβῆς εὐλάβεια), which prevents them from using or producing cataphatic theology lest they impair divine transcendence.⁴⁵² This fear, he explains, results in their “failing to acquire that

Superstition and Religious Beliefs,” in *The Seventh Book of the “Stromateis”: Proceedings of the Colloquium on Clement of Alexandria, Olomouc, October, 21–23, 2010*, ed. Matyáš Havrdáš, Vít Hušek, Jana Plátová (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 113–30, at 118–22.

- 452 See, for instance, Gregory Acindynos’s report of 1340/41 on the private discussion he had with Palamas about the strange, new names (‘καινοφωνήματα’; ‘ὀνομάτων καινότητες’; ‘καινὸν ῥῆμα’; ‘ξένη φωνή’) Palamas used, claiming to possess the high knowledge of ‘contemplative men’ (Gregory Acindynos, *Discourse to the Patriarch John Calecas* 4; 5; 11; 30; 34; ll. 87–94; 251; 259; 1056; 1088; in Juan Nadal Cañellas, “Gregorio Akíndinos,” in *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, 11, XIII^e–XIX^e siècles, ed. Carmelo G. Conticello and Vassa Conticello [Turnhout: Brepols, 2002], 189–314, at 260; 264; 283; 284). Palamas treats *expressis verbis* the problem of the relation between fidelity to the ecclesiastical tradition and novelty of expression in the Prologue to his *Hagioreitic Tome* (Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, 11, 567, 1–569, 2). There, he proves bolder. Speaking in the name of the monks “that have been united with God and have been initiated to the supra-mental realities” as well of those monks who, though lacking such an experience, ‘believe’ in what they are told by the former ones (op. cit., 568, 3–5; 568, 20–569, 2), Palamas defends the theological legitimacy of the then-debated doctrine of the participation of man in the divine ‘energies’ (conceived of as distinct from the divine ‘essence’) against the charge of innovation on two grounds. (i) All the major truths revealed by God, such as the doctrine of the triunity of God formulated first by some Fathers of the Church long ago, seemed in their time strange and innovative or even contrary to the traditional revealed truths, yet later on seemed quite natural to all. (ii) The divine men had known in advance the truths to be declared in a later stage of the divine revelation; hence their writings, carefully read, can justify these truths. Palamas seems to mingle the knowledge and the formulation of a revealed truth into one, which implies that his defence of the legitimacy of expressing the revealed truths by means of new words or terms is not far away from defending the legitimacy of announcing and establishing revealed truths that are new to the majority of the Christian folk. He argues that one should not stubbornly close one’s ears to theological formulations that sound contrary to the commonly accepted ones (“ἀνωμολογημένη φωνή”; op. cit., 567, 11–568, 1). Rather, a man should listen ‘with piety and respect’ (‘μετ’ εὐλαβείας’; op. cit., 568, 3) to what is said by the few purified, contemplative men who know the mysteries of the Spirit. In the *Synodal Tome* of 1368, Palamas was explicitly declared to be equal to the God-bearing Fathers of the Church (ll. 730–732 and 783–784; in Antonio Rigo, “Il monte Athos e la controversia palamitica dal concilio del 1351 al *Tomo sinodale* del 1368: Giacomo Trikanas, Procoro Cidone e Filoteo Kokkinos,” in *Gregorio Palamas e oltre: Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*, ed. Antonio Rigo [Florence: Olschki, 2004], 1–177, at 126; 127). At the same time, the community of the Holy Mountain (‘τὸ ἱερόν ἐκεῖνο σύστημα,’ which includes some exceptional figures such as Palamas) was *expressis verbis* presented as the bearer of the “holy erudition,

knowledge of God which is objectively accessible (to man)" (ἀποτυγχάνουσι τῆς ἐφικτῆς θεογνωσίας).⁴⁵³ Further, he appeals to some relevant passages from Gregory Nazianzen (e.g., ἐκεῖ 'φοβούμενοι φόβον, οὐ μὴ ἔστι φόβος' [Ps. 52: 6]).⁴⁵⁴ In this context, Palamas appeals, *inter alia*, to some well-known patristic

particularly the part of it that regards the correct and sane faith and the correct and sane religious beliefs" (ll. 36–38; op. cit., 100). This appropriation (or usurpation) by the Holy Mountain of the *officium* of the institutional Church to define ecclesiastical truth reflects Palamas's idea of the superiority of the 'spirit' over the 'letter' of dogma, or the superiority of true piety over the superstitious obsession with the 'letter.' Palamas's Prologue to his *Hagioreitic Tome* must have been the basis for the justification that Mark Eugenikos (ca. 1392–1445) offered for the apparently innovative character of the 'essence' / 'energies' distinction in his *Κεφάλαια συλλογιστικά κατὰ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν Ἀκινδυνιστῶν περὶ διακρίσεως οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας – περὶ τοῦ θείου φωτός – περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν χαρισμάτων* (see the passage in Irenaios Bulović, *Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Τριάδι διακρίσεως τῆς θείας οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Μάρκον Ἐφέσου τὸν Εὐγενικόν* [Thessaloniki: Patriarchikon Hidryma Paterikon Meleton, 1983], 67–68, n. 43). – A similar critique of some insane theological views is ascribed to Socrates in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (I, 1, 14: "τῶν τε γὰρ μαινομένων τοὺς μὲν οὐδὲ τὰ δεινὰ δεδιέναι, τοὺς δὲ καὶ τὰ μὴ φοβερὰ φοβείσθαι" / "As some madmen have no fear of danger and others are afraid of where there is nothing to be afraid of"; in Edgar C. Marchant, *Xenophontis opera omnia*, II [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921], 3, 28–30; tr. Marchant, in *Xenophon. Memorabilia – Oeconomicus* [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1923; 81997], 9).

453 Op. cit. 6; 13 (Matsoukas, op. cit., 482, 21; 482, 24; 490, 22). Palamas seems to reproduce George Pachymeres's paraphrase of Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite's *De divinis nominibus* III, 3 ("... πάντως ἂν εἰς τοῦτο διὰ περισσὴν εὐλάβειαν [cf. Palamas, *ibid.*, 482, 21: "... ὅπ' ἀνευλαβοῦς εὐλαβεῖς...", which should be distinguished from the proper 'εὐλάβεια' as described in the passage quoted *supra*, n. 452] ἐηλύθμεν, εἰς τὸ μηδὲν ἀκούειν ἢ λέγειν τι περὶ τῆς θείας φιλοσοφίας..... Οὐ χρὴ τῆς ἐνδεχομένης τῶν θείων γνώσεως ἀμελεῖν..."; in Beate-Regina Suchla, ed., *Corpus dionysiacum*, I, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De divinis nominibus* [PTS 33; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990], 142, 10–13): "... Οὐ δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἀμελεῖν τῆς ἐνδεχομένης τῶν θείων..... Πρὸς τὴν ἐφικτὴν τῶν θείων εὕρεσιν μὴ ἀποδειλιάσαντες..." (PG 3, 692C2–3; D1–2; the parallels and references offered in the app. font., ad 142, 10 are misleading, with the single exception of the insignificant ad loc. *glossa* of Pseudo-Maximus Confessor in PG 4, 237C). Palamas subscribes to Pseudo-Dionysius's idea that the divine things are partly knowable and partly unknowable and that, therefore, piety consists in abstaining from scrutinizing the former and being eager to acquire a solid knowledge of the latter; he also accuses the 'Barlaamites' of pseudo-piously stressing the former to the detriment of the latter.

454 Matsoukas, op. cit., 486, nn. 1 and 2; 490, n. 2; 491, n. 1. Cf. also Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio xxxiii* 9, 6–7 in Mossay and Lafontaine, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 20–23*, 300; Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* III, 2, 114 in Werner Jaeger, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, II [Leiden: Brill, 1960], 90, 5–7; Pseudo-Basil of Caesarea (Didymus Caecus), *Adversus Eunomium v* (PG 29, 760B2).

passages (from Basil of Caesarea, Gregory Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, and Maximus Confessor), which stress that truly pious theology does not adore words and terms but cares about correct content. This idea is plainly expressed by Philo, too, in *De somniis*, which was much read in fourteenth-century Byzantium; tellingly, Philo expresses the idea in order to abjure 'superstition':

[...] οὐ δεισιδαιμονῶν περὶ τὴν θέσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἀλλ' ἐν τέλος προτεθειμένος, πραγματολογήσαι.

[...] not from any superstitious nicety in applying names, but with one aim before him, to use words to express facts.⁴⁵⁵

Furthermore, it is precisely in this context that Palamas introduces Philo's description of 'superstition' as 'godlessness' (using Synesius as a pretext).

One might also take into account that *Corpus hermeticum* IX.10 includes a defence of cataphatic theology against excessive apophaticism (which is presented as springing from 'superstition'):

Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς οὐχ, ὥσπερ ἐνίοις δόξει, ἀναίσθητός ἐστι καὶ ἀνόητος· ὑπὸ γὰρ δεισιδαιμονίας⁴⁵⁶ βλασφημοῦσι.

God is not devoid of sense and thought, as in times to come some men will think He is; those who speak thus of God blaspheme through excess of reverence.⁴⁵⁷

Immediately, within the same chapter, it is explained that God's 'sense' and 'thought' refer to His property of being the perpetual cause of the existence and the activity of all things. Denying Him this property out of an alleged reverence towards His transcendence, and out of fear of describing Him in positive terms, would impair His very divinity. In fact, such a denial, for all

455 Philo of Alexandria, *De somniis* 1, 230 (ed. Wendland, *Philonis*, III, 254, 3–5; tr. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo*, v, 419).

456 This lexeme is quite rare in the *Corpus Hermeticum*; see Louis Delatte, Susanne Govaerts, and Joseph Denooz, *Index du Corpus Hermeticum* (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo & Bizzarri, 1977), 43, s.v.

457 Arthur Darby Nock, *Corpus Hermeticum*, I, *Traité 1–XII* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1946; 71991), 100; tr. Scott, *Hermetica*, 185. Cf. Scott's explanatory comment: "It is their anxiety to exalt God to the utmost [...], that leads them into this error" (op. cit., II, 222).

its apparently pious motives, would amount to blasphemy. This idea is not far from Palamas's insistence, both in this *Epistle*⁴⁵⁸ and throughout the majority of his writings, on the true reality and full divinity of the 'divine energies,' without which, as he states, the divine essence is inconceivable. There was thus quite a strong reason for Palamas to be pleased by the statement in the *Corpus hermeticum*. It was not the first time that Palamas, following a long list of eminent Christian intellectuals, including Gregory Nazianzen and Basil of Caesarea,⁴⁵⁹ would be positively inspired by that body of materials.⁴⁶⁰

So, to sum up Palamas's anti-Sceptical stance: Palamas's Sub-category (A₃) of 'atheism' includes both Dogmatic (A_{3i}) and Ephectic (A_{3ii}) Scepticism. The fact that he included (A₃) in his scheme can be accounted for in terms of his unacknowledged yet direct usage of Philo's *De praemiis et poenis*, whereas it seems that it was the occurrence of Metrodorus's name in Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus* (see *supra*, 369) that led him to have a look at Eusebius of Caesarea's *Praeparatio evangelica* and Sextus Empiricus in order to describe (A_{3i}). In this context, he construed Xenophanes's B₃₄ as equivalent to Metrodorus's extreme Dogmatic Scepticism, namely as an absolute declaration of human ignorance about everything. As for his description of Ephectic Scepticism as atheism (A_{3ii}): its core corresponds to Philo's description of agnosticism (taken as the second form of 'atheism'), although Palamas abstained from reproducing Philo's silent quotation of Protagoras's B₄ (which Palamas replaced with the names of 'Sextus,' 'Pyrrho,' and their followers, whom he presents as 'Ephectic' – i.e., as thinkers who give their consent to none of the statements made by the others, not even to moderate claims that would fall under Xenophanean δόκος). Palamas's clear differentiation between Dogmatic Scepticism or epistemological nihilism (Xenophanes, Metrodorus), and Ephectic or 'all-contradicting' Scepticism (Οἱ δὲ... Εἰσι δ' οἱ...) was implicit in Eusebius of Caesarea's characterisation of the latter as a development of the ἀφορμαί that had sprung from the former (see *supra*, 274).⁴⁶¹

458 Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to the Monk Dionysius* 9; 10; 11 et al. (Matsoukas, op. cit., 486, 1–2; 487, 12–14; 488, 9–10).

459 Salvatore Lilla, "Le fonti di una sezione dell'omelia *De fide* di S. Basilio Magno," *Augustinianum* 29, 1 (1989): 5–19, at 14–15; Claudio Moreschini, *Storia dell'ermetismo cristiano* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 2000), 93–104 *passim*; Andreas Röw, *Hermes Trismegistos als Zeuge der Wahrheit. Die christliche Hermetikrezeption von Athenagoras bis Laktanz* (Berlin: Philo, 2002), *passim*. On Gregory Nazianzen see *supra*, 342, n. 314.

460 See Demetracopoulos, "Thomas Aquinas," 387–90.

461 George Cedrenos's (12th cent.) account of Pyrrhonism (*Compendium historiarum*, PG 121, 320B–C; the text seems gravely corrupted) exhibits some similarities to Palamas's account. Still, it seems that the similarities are due to the use of some common sources

2.3 Palamas's Positive Use of Scepticism

We have seen (above, 369) that Palamas quoted Xenophanes's B34 as an emblematic statement of Scepticism and construed it as a declaration of a deplorable nihilism that constitutes one of the heathen forms of 'atheism' or 'godlessness.' Still, it would be wrong to conclude that Palamas rejected heathen scepticism because it downgraded human cognitive faculties. As I have tried to show elsewhere,⁴⁶² Palamas and many of his followers⁴⁶³ held that knowledge proper can be gained only through the divine grace, i.e., by means of Revelation, which sheds its supernatural light on man through the Holy Scripture and Incarnation, as well as through the supernatural illumination caused by ecstatic union with God even in this life. For Palamas, whatever is called 'knowledge' within a secular context borders on nothing. As we will now see, the second clause of this general Palamite stance was expressed in Platonic and Sceptical terms.

Palamas, at an apparently innocent point in an *Oration*, namely, around the end of his long exordium, writes:

Τὴν γὰρ τῶν λόγων φύσιν ἐπ' ἀσθενοῦς ὀχοῦμεθα ῥώμης, πολλῶν ὄντων καὶ μεγάλων τῶν δυσχερῶν καὶ παντάπασιν ἀδυνάτων διελθεῖν, ἣν μὴ θεία τις ἄνωθεν προσῆ βοήθεια.⁴⁶⁴

As far as the nature of scholarly erudition and speculation is concerned, I sail upon a vessel rather weak in strength, because the matters that are difficult, not to say absolutely impossible, to come up with, are numerous and great – unless some divine help comes down and adds itself [to my efforts].

In the exordia of their panegyric orations, Byzantine authors typically declared personal inadequacy before the divine height of the subject to be

(including Clement's *Protrepticus*, as far as Cedrenos's exposition of ancient Greek philosophy is concerned) rather than to an alleged direct use of Cedrenos's lines by Palamas. More on Cedrenos's sources will hopefully be revealed in the forthcoming critical edition by Riccardo Maisano and Luigi Tartaglia.

462 Demetracopoulos, "Thomas Aquinas," 385–87.

463 See Demetracopoulos, "Thomas Aquinas," 387–403. On 390, Neilos, Patriarch of Constantinople (1380–88), by mistake passed by as 'Neilos Cabasilas.'

464 Gregory Palamas, *Homily LIII* 27, in Γρηγορίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τοῦ Παλαμᾶ ὁμιλίαι ΚΒ', αἱ προστετέθησαν ὃ τε ἐπιστολιμαῖος Λόγος πρὸς Ἰωάννην καὶ Θεόδωρον τοὺς φιλοσόφους καὶ τέσσαρες Εὐχαί, ed. Sophokles K. Oikonomos (Athens: Ph. Karampinis and K. Vaphas, 1861), 163, 5–8. Cf. Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 212, n. 287; id., *Αὐγουστίνος*, 98–101.

treated; here, Palamas reproduces this rhetorical topos (Τὴν γὰρ [...] ῥώμης). But he does something more, as well. His reproduction has a peculiarity: it sounds like a paraphrase of the famous passage from Plato's *Phaedo* (quoted above 263; cf. Palamas / Plato: τῶν λόγων / λόγου; ὀχούμεθα / ὀχούμενον; δυσχερῶν / παγχάλεπον; ἀδυνάτων / ἀδύνατον; διελθεῖν / διαπορευθῆναι and διαπλευσαι; ἤν μὴ θεία τις / εἰ μὴ [...] θείου τινός), which Basil of Caesarea had mingled with Sextus Empiricus's introduction to the *Adversus Mathematicos* so as to establish the necessity of supernatural guidance. Palamas plays with the various Byzantine meanings of the word λόγος/-οι (*i*: speech or oration;⁴⁶⁵ *ii*: erudition which enables one to speculate on high subject matters; *iii*: philosophical truth-claims). He also plays with the Platonic comparison of man's struggle for truth to a journey, giving the metaphor a more pessimistic tenor. In this unacknowledged quotation of Plato's passage, Palamas omits the possibility that one can overcome obstacles and hindrances and find the truth on one's own; God's help is the only way forward.

Palamas extends his repudiation of human knowledge to include ignorance of worldly realities. To him,⁴⁶⁶ philosophy and science

λόγου δεῖται, τούτου τοῦ προφερομένου δηλαδὴ [...], ἔτι δὲ συλλογισμῶν παντοδαπῆς ὕλης καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἀποδείξεως ἀναγκῶν⁴⁶⁷ καὶ τῶν κατὰ κόσμον παραδειγμάτων,⁴⁶⁸ ὧν ἐκ τοῦ ὁρᾶν καὶ ἀκοῦειν τὸ πᾶν ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον ἀθροίζεται καὶ σχεδὸν τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ' (I Cor. 3:19; 7:31; Eph. 2:2) στρεφομένων ἐστί, καὶ γένοιτ' ἂν δήπου καὶ τοῖς 'τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου' "σοφοῖς" (I Cor. 1:20; 2:6; 4:4), κὰν μὴ κεκαθαρμένοι τελέως τὸν βίον ὧσι καὶ τὴν ψυχῇν.

[Philosophy and science] stand in need of speech (I mean this common oral speech) [...]; further, they need all the sorts of syllogisms and the various kinds of necessarily drawn conclusions as well as [the kinds] of examples provided by the world; now all (or nearly all) these things

465 In this respect, Palamas's plural ('ὀχούμεθα') is not only a rhetorical means of kind self-reference but also an implicit reference to all men, equivalent to Plato's indefinite 'τις' (*Phaedo* 85C6; D2).

466 Gregory Palamas, *Homily LIII* 32, in Oikonomos, *Γρηγορίου*, 170, 1–9 = id., *Triads I* 3 42 (Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, I, 453, 12–18). In the latter writing, 'τελέως' has been removed; apparently, Palamas wanted to avoid implying that some sort or degree of purity of life and soul can be obtained by heathen philosophers.

467 Cf. Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics* 74b13–18: "ἡ ἀπόδειξις ἀναγκαίων ἐστί, καὶ εἰ ἀποδέδεικται, οὐχ οἷον τ' ἄλλως ἔχειν· ἐξ ἀναγκαίων ἄρα δεῖ εἶναι τὸν συλλογισμόν. [...]" *Ἡ ἀπόδειξις ἐξ ἀναγκαίων*."

468 Cf. Aristotle, *Prior Analytics* 68b38–69a19.

are gathered from sight and hearing, and belong in a lump to the trivial things and processes that occur in 'this world,' and can be obtained even by the 'sages of this century,' even though they have not absolutely purified their lives and souls.

Profane or scientific knowledge, explains Palamas,⁴⁶⁹ derives from ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων ἢ τῶν ὁρωμένων στοχαστικὴ ἀναλογία, which is χαμαίζηλος ('abject') and ἀνθρωπίνῃ ('human-fashioned'). This scornful language should not be taken as a rhetorical exaggeration. Palamas selects words carefully: he calls the knowledge provided by sciences στοχαστικὴ (conjectural) and describes it as attained by means of ἀναλογία. According to the ancient Greek classification of τέχναι ('arts,' i.e., the various branches of civilization created by human skill and inventiveness), the στοχαστικαὶ τέχναι enjoy an intermediary status, standing lower than the ἐλευθέροι τέχναι (or μαθήματα or παιδεῖαι or λόγοι or διατριβαί or ἐπιστήμαι) ('liberal' or 'civilized' 'arts' or 'disciplines') and higher than the βάνανσοι (or βανανυστικάι or ἀνελεύθεροι) τέχναι ('manual arts').⁴⁷⁰ Sextus Empiricus, whose writings Palamas used on various occasions,⁴⁷¹ explicitly testifies to the ancient idea that the 'stochastic arts' (such as government and medicine) are inferior inasmuch as they fall short of accuracy and guaranteed effectiveness; they fail due to the fact that they are based simply on repeated experience (ἐμπειρία) and chance (τύχη).⁴⁷² That Palamas's comparison of the conjectural to the liberal arts implicitly downgrades the latter (especially the highest amongst them, i.e., the various branches of science) can be seen from the fact that Basil of Caesarea belittles the two conjectural arts mentioned by Sextus by classifying them as 'manual.'⁴⁷³ It is not the higher part of Palamas's comparison that elevates the lower, but rather the lower that abases the higher – and the whole is not much higher than everyday base activities.⁴⁷⁴

469 Gregory Palamas, *Homily LIII* 33, in Oikonomos, *Γρηγορίου*, 171, 1–4.

470 Cf. the *locus classicus* in Aristotle's *Politics* 1337b4–21.

471 See Demetracopoulos, *Αἰγιστίνος*, 55–79; 199–202.

472 Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* 1, 72 in Mau, *Sexti*, III, 20.

473 See, e.g., Basil of Caesarea, *Epistle CCXXXIII* 1, 26–29: "ἡ τῶν βαναύσων τούτων τεχνῶν ἀνάληψις [...] κυβερνητικῆς ἢ ἱατρικῆς" (in Yves Courtonne, *Saint Basile. Lettres*, III [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966], 40).

474 Surprisingly, Palamas, in *Homily XXVI* 1–3 (PG 151, 332C–333C), expresses the opposite view, namely, that the human soul, using its five cognitive faculties (sense, representation, opinion, discursive reason, and intellect), is capable of understanding the natural processes that take place on earth, in the heavens, and in-between. Palamas's view, however, has a rhetorical purpose: to show the superiority of man to the other creatures.

Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* II.11, 95a3–9⁴⁷⁵ gave rise to a long chain of passages that explain the methodological and epistemological status of the 'stochastic arts' more systematically. According to the unanimous analysis of this passage by a long list of authors from the ancient Greek and Byzantine commentary tradition⁴⁷⁶ (a list that can be enriched with numerous passages from other ancient Greek authors),⁴⁷⁷ medicine, navigation, rhetoric, gymnastics,

475 “Εν δὲ τοῖς ἀπὸ διανοίας τὰ μὲν οὐδέποτε ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτομάτου ὑπάρχει, οἷον οἰκία ἢ ἀνδριάς, οὐδ’ ἐξ ἀνάγκης, ἀλλ’ ἕνεκά του, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τύχης, οἷον ὑγίεια καὶ σωτηρία. Μάλιστα δὲ ἐν ὅσοις ἐνδέχεται καὶ ὧδε καὶ ἄλλως, ὅταν μὴ ἀπὸ τύχης ἢ γένεσις ἢ ὥστε τὸ τέλος ἀγαθόν, ἕνεκά του γίνεται, καὶ ἡ φύσις ἢ τέχνη. Ἀπὸ τύχης δ’ οὐδὲν ἕνεκά του γίνεται”. Cf. Ross, *Aristotle's Prior and Posterior Analytics*, 646. Cf. Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* 87b19–27: “Τοῦ δ’ ἀπὸ τύχης οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιστήμη δι’ ἀποδείξεως. Οὔτε γάρ ὡς ἀναγκαῖον οὐθ’ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τὸ ἀπὸ τύχης ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τὸ παρὰ αὐτὰ γινόμενον· ἢ δ’ ἀπόδειξις θατέρου τούτων. Πᾶς γάρ συλλογισμὸς ἢ δι’ ἀναγκαίων ἢ διὰ τῶν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ προτάσεων· καὶ εἰ μὲν αἱ προτάσεις ἀναγκαῖαι, καὶ τὸ συμπεράσμα ἀναγκαῖον, εἰ δ’ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, καὶ τὸ συμπεράσμα τοιοῦτον. Ὡστ’ εἰ τὸ ἀπὸ τύχης μήθ’ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ μήτ’ ἀναγκαῖον, οὐκ ἂν εἴη αὐτοῦ ἀπόδειξις”. See also Aristotle, *Topics* 101b6–10. Cf. Aristotle's distinction between τέχνη and ἐπιστήμη (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1139b15–1140a234; *Magna Moralia* 1196b37–1197a13). Cf. Plato, *Philebus* 55E5–56C2; *Leges* 709A1–B4; (Pseudo-)Plato, *Epinomis* 975C4–8.

476 Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis “Analyticorum priorum” librum I commentarium*, in Maximilian Wallies, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis In Aristotelis Analyticorum priorum librum I commentarium* (CAG II, 1; Berlin 1883), 39, 30–40, 5; 165, 8–10; id., *In Aristotelis “Topicorum” libros octo commentaria*, in Wallies, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis In Aristotelis Topicorum commentaria* (CAG II, 2; Berlin: Reimers, 1891), 32, 15–20; 33, 17–22; Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Quaestiones et solutiones*, in Ivo Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora* (CAG, Suppl. II, 2; Berlin: Reimer, 1892), 61, 17–28; Themistius, *Analyticorum posteriorum paraphrasis*, in Maximilian Wallies, *Themistii Analyticorum posteriorum paraphrasis* (CAG V, 1; Berlin: Reimer, 1900), 53, 17–19; Themistius (attrib.), *Quae fertur in Aristotelis Analyticorum priorum librum I paraphrasis*, in Wallies, *Themistii quae fertur in Aristotelis Analyticorum priorum librum I paraphrasis* (CAG XXIII, 3; Berlin: Reimer, 1884), 18, 31–33; John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Analytica posteriora commentaria*, in Wallies, *Joannis Philoponi In Aristotelis Analytica posteriora commentaria cum anonymo in librum II* (CAG XIII, 3; Berlin: Reimer, 1909), 385, 13–25; Eustratius of Nicaea, *In Aristotelis Analyticorum posteriorum librum secundum commentarium*, in Michael Hayduck, *Eustratii In Analyticorum posteriorum librum secundum commentarium* (CAG XXI, 1; Berlin: Reimer, 1907), 156, 16–28; 158, 16–20; id., *In Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea I commentaria*, in Gustavus Heylbut, *Eustratii et Michaelis et anonyma in Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea commentaria* (CAG XX; Berlin: Reimer, 1892), 15, 4–23; 30, 15–19; 36, 17–19; id., *In Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea VI commentaria*, in Gustavus Heylbut, op. cit., 402, 6–7.

477 Philo of Alexandria, *Legatio ad Gaium* 21, in Leopold Cohn and Siegfried Reiter, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, Vol. VI (Berlin: Reimer, 1915; repr. 1962), 159, 17–19: “[...] ἀγνοίᾳ τῆς ἀληθείας· τυφλώττει γὰρ ὁ ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς πρὸς τὴν τοῦ συμφέροντος ὄντως αἰσθησιν, εἰκασίᾳ καὶ στοχασμῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἐπιστήμῃ χρῆσθαι δυνάμενος” / “[...] They did

and divination fall under the ‘conjectural’ or ‘approximate arts.’⁴⁷⁸ What all of these activities share is that they are capable of reaching their end only when chance (τύχη) favors them. Based on contingent data (ἐνδεχόμενα) and following rules that can be defined only loosely, the result of this kind of research is far from enjoying certainty (βέβαιον). Put in practical terms, there is little likelihood that one might succeed in guessing what is going on and what will go

not know the truth. The human mind in its blindness does not perceive its real interest and all it can do is to take conjecture and guesswork for its guide instead of knowledge” (tr. Francis Henry Colson, *Philo. The Embassy to Gaius* [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1962; ³1991], 13); *Excerpta varia de “Phaenomenis” Arati* 1, in Jean Martin, *Scholia in Aratum vetera* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1974), 539, 7–8 and 15–16: “πράγματα ἀσαφὴ καὶ στοχαστικά καὶ ἄδηλα. [...] Στοχασμούς ἀδήλους [...], καθάπερ οἱ φιλόσοφοι”; Galen, *De compositione medicamentorum per genera*, in Carl Gottlob Kühn, *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, XIII (Leipzig: Carl Cnoblochii, 1827; Hildesheim: Olms 1965), 621, 3; 887, 4–5; Pseudo-Galen, *De optima secta ad Thrasybulum*, in Carl Gottlob Kühn, op. cit., I (Leipzig: Carl Cnoblochii, 1821; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1964), 115, 1–4 (cf. Hankinson, “Galen on the Limitations,” 218; 227; 236); Basil of Caesarea (dub.), *Enarratio in prophetam Isaiam* III, 102 in PG 30, 284D: “στοχαστῆς [...] ὁ δὲ σύνεσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ὁμοίου παραθέσεως διὰ τὴν πείραν τῶν προλαβόντων τὸ μέλλον συντεκμαιρόμενος” (this is what Palamas calls “conjectural analogy”; see *supra*, 385). Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* I, 29, 181, 5 (ed. Stählin, Früchtel, and Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, II, 111, 7: “στοχασμός” vs. “κατάληψις”); VI, 9, 76, 4 and 17, 154, 4–155, 1 (ed. Patrick Descourtieux, *Clément d’Alexandrie. Les Stromates. Stromate VI* (Paris: Cerf, 1999) 214; 368–70); Proclus, *In primum Euclidis “Elementorum” librum commentarii* (ed. Gottfried Friedlein, *Procli Diadochi in primum Euclidis Elementorum librum commentarii* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1873], 30, 25–31, 11); id., *De decem dubitationibus circa providentiam* 65, 13–20 (ed. Helmut Boese, *Procli Diadochi tria opuscula [De providentia, libertate, malo] Latine Guilelmo de Moerbeka vertente et Graece ex Isaacii Sebastocratoris aliorumque scriptis collecta* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1960], 107: “οὐκ ἐν λογισμοῖς στοχαστικοῖς τῶν ἐσομένων [...]. Κριεττόνως ἢ κατὰ λογισμόν”). On Alexander of Aphrodisias and Galen see Katerina Ierodiakonou, “Alexander of Aphrodisias on Medicine as a Stochastic Art,” in *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context. Papers Read at the Congress Held at Leiden University, 13–15 April 1992*, ed. Philip Van der Eijk, H.F.J. (Manfred) Horstmanshoff, and Pieter Herman Schrijvers, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995), II, 473–85. On the stochastic arts in general see also James Allen, “Failure and Expertise in the Ancient Conception of an Art,” in *Scientific Failure*, ed. Tamara Horowitz and Allen Ira Janis (London: Rowman and Littlefield, 1994), 81–107; Véronique Boudon-Millot, “Art, Science and Conjecture from Hippocrates to Plato and Aristotle,” in *Hippocrates in Context: Papers Read at the xith International Hippocrates Colloquium*, ed. Philip Van Der Eijk (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 87–99.

478 These translations render the rank of the epistemological result of the process of στοχασμός (see Johannes M. Van Ophijnsen, tr., *Alexander of Aphrodisias. On Aristotle’s Topics* [London: Bloomsbury, 2001], 152, n. 295) I would add ‘tentative,’ to render the very process referred to by the Greek noun.

on in fields lying beyond one's direct grasp.⁴⁷⁹ That Palamas had read many of the above commentators and authors is certain.⁴⁸⁰

Moreover, the occurrence of στοχασμός in Philo of Alexandria's *De opificio mundi* (cf. *supra*, 290) was certainly known to Palamas, who had read and used this Philonic writing.⁴⁸¹ This observation is quite important, because in *De opificio* Philo connects the limited power of στοχασμός to man's innate liability to error in all things including the divine things (see 289–291 above) – and that connection was the point at stake in Palamas's discussion.⁴⁸²

A pejorative equation of heathen philosophy en bloc with στοχασμός occurs, as we have seen (*supra*, 309), in the *Pseudo-Clementina*, where the core of the argument of Xenophanes's B34 is used against all philosophical schools.

479 See, e.g., Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* 11, 97: "Τὸ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἀδήλων καταστοχάζεσθαι καὶ τινα τῶν ἀποκρύφων γνῶσιν ἐξ 'ἐπινοίας' ἀνθρωπίνων 'λογισμῶν' (Sap. Sol. 9:14: "Λογισμοὶ γὰρ θνητῶν δειλοὶ, καὶ ἐπισφαλεῖς αἱ ἐπίνοιαὶ ἡμῶν") ἐρευνᾶσθαι πάροδον καὶ ἀκολουθίαν καὶ ταῖς διεψευσμέναις τῶν ὑπολήψεων δίδωσιν, διότι τῶν ἀγνωστούμενων ὁ στοχασμός οὐ μόνον τὸ ἀληθές, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸ πολλάκις τὸ ψεῦδος ὡς ἀληθές ὑπολήπεται" / "Speculating about the obscure, and using the 'concepts' of human 'reason' to search for some kind of knowledge of things hidden, allows admission and currency also to false ideas, since speculation about the unknown accepts as true not only what is true, but often also what is false" (ed. Werner Jaeger, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, 1, *Contra Eunomium 1–11* [Leiden: Brill, 1960], 255, 2–8; tr. Stuart G. Hall, in Karfiková et al., *Proceedings*, 81). Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Canticorum* 1 (ed. Hermann Langerbeck, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, VI [Leiden: Brill, 1960], 36, 20–37, 3).

480 For instance, Palamas used Philoponus's *Commentary on the "Posterior Analytics"*: see John A. Demetracopoulos, *The Christian Platonism of Barlaam the Calabrian: in Search of the Theological and Philosophical Background to His Greek Epistles*, forthcoming). In general, Palamas's knowledge of ancient Greek literature was wide and thorough; his negative assessment of ancient Greek philosophy should not lead us to believe otherwise.

481 Demetracopoulos, "Palamas Transformed," 355, nn. 287 and 288.

482 Besides, this passage sounds as though it might be a forerunner of Paul's famous, bitterly anti-philosophical critique in Rom. 1:21–25: "Ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν. [...] Φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν. [...] Μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει καὶ ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα". See Henry Chadwick, "St. Paul and Philo of Alexandria," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library Manchester* 48, 2 (1965/66): 286–307, at 293; cf. David T. Runia, *Filone di Alessandria nella prima letteratura cristiana. Uno studio d'insieme* [Milan: Vita et Pensiero, 1999], 74). Not surprisingly, Palamas quotes this Pauline passage several times in his writings against Barlaam (Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, 1, 700: Index locorum Sacrae Scripturae). On Paul's direct dependence on Philo see also Churchill Babington, "St Paul and Philo; a Passage in 1 Cor., Illustrated from Philo Judaeus," in *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* 1 (1854): 47–51; Siegfried, *Philo*, 304–10. One can find more in David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria: An Annotated Bibliography 1987–1996* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

Note, in this context, that *στοχάζεσθαι* literally means taking aim (from some rather long distance) and shooting (with a bow). According to the second of Sextus Empiricus's two illustrations of Xenophanes's Scepticism,⁴⁸³ if the thing to be known lies within our reach, there is no need to follow this aiming and shooting process, for truth is evident and manifest (*πρόδηλον καὶ ἐναργές*), and agreement between people easily reached.⁴⁸⁴ However, if the thing under research lies beyond direct grasp (*ἄδηλον καὶ ἀποκεκρυμμένον*) and the archers lie in almost full darkness (*ἐν βαθεί σχεδὸν σκότῳ*), the only thing they can do after having shot is take refuge in this doubtful process, knowing in advance that certainty is from the outset impossible and agreement will be hard to attain.⁴⁸⁵ Sextus accounts for the disagreements that result by saying that neither he who did strike the mark nor he who failed is in a position to see where his arrow struck; the best a bowman can do is guess (*εἰκάζειν*) and argue (*καταπιθανεύεσθαι*) for his possible but quite uncertain success. Interestingly, Sextus goes on to note that "this was said for the first time by Xenophanes" (in his B34).

Moreover, Palamas calls the philosophical and scientific endeavour *στοχαστική ἀνάλογια* (385). He does not use the substantive noun in the meaning of 'proportion'; rather, he refers to the Stoic *ἀναλογισμός*, which is the process of knowing "the things forever hidden from our direct grasp."⁴⁸⁶ In the case

483 Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* VIII, 322–325 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 177–8). Cf. Sextus's use of *στοχάζεσθαι* in op. cit. v, 24 (Mau post Mutschmann, *Sexti*, III, 145) and VII, 365 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 83).

484 Cf. Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics* 88a11–14: "Ἔστι μέντοι ἕνια ἀναγόμενα εἰς αἰσθήσεως ἔκλειψιν ἐν τοῖς προβλήμασιν. Ἐνια γὰρ εἰ ἐρωώμεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐξητούμεν, οὐχ ὥς εἰδότες τῷ ὁρᾶν, ἀλλ' ὥς ἔχοντες τὸ καθόλου ἐκ τοῦ ὁρᾶν" / "There are some problems, however, which are referable to a failure of sense-perception; e.g., there are phenomena whose explanation would cause no difficulty if we could see what happens not because we know a thing by seeing it, but because seeing it enables us to grasp the universal" (tr. Hugh Tredennick in *Aristotle in Twenty-Three Volumes*, II [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1960; 41989], 159).

485 Cf. Plato's simile in *Republic* 508D4–9: "Ὅταν μὲν οὖν καταλάμπει ἀλήθειά τε καὶ τὸ ὄν, εἰς τοῦτο ἀπερείσῃται, ἐνόησέν τε καὶ ἔγνω αὐτὸ καὶ νοῦν ἔχειν φαίνεται· ὅταν δὲ εἰς τὸ τῷ σκότῳ κεκραμένον, [...] δοξάζει τε καὶ ἀμβλυώττει ἄνω καὶ κάτω τὰς δόξας μεταβάλλον" / "When it is firmly fixed on the domain where truth and reality shine resplendent it apprehends and knows them and appears to possess reason; but when it inclines to that region which is mingled with darkness, the world of becoming and passing away, it opines only and its edge is blunted, and it shifts its opinions hither and thither" (tr. Shorey, *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, VI, 103).

486 See John A. Demetracopoulos, "Οἱ πηγές τοῦ περιεχομένου καὶ τῆς χρήσης τοῦ ὅρου 'ἐπίνοια' στὸ Κατὰ Εὐνομίῳ I τοῦ Βασιλείου Καισαρείας: Στωϊκοὶ καὶ Πλωτῖνος" (with an English

of the stochastic art of medicine, Galen informs us that the most optimistic medical school, the 'Dogmatic' or 'Logical' one (cf. Palamas's συλλογισμοὶ καὶ αἱ ἐξ ἀποδείξεως ἀνάγκαι, *supra*, 384), is also called ἀναλογιστική⁴⁸⁷ and that the Empirical medical school, whose epistemological background was Sceptic, accepted only ἐπιλογισμός, namely, the demonstrative process of moving from something evident to something only temporarily non-evident, modestly avowing that the things standing permanently beyond our direct grasp lie beyond our grasp in general.⁴⁸⁸ So, although Palamas, in this context, did not appeal to B34, his argument against the validity of every heathen philosophical and scientific doctrine with no exception is akin to Sextus's explanation of B34.

Furthermore, because Palamas states that all scientific knowledge is based on παραδείγματα (*supra*, 384), he probably thought of στοχασμός as a mere case of analogical reasoning or παράδειγμα, i.e., as a process of inference. According to Ammonius's account,⁴⁸⁹ παράδειγμα is, for one thing, similar to induction (ἐπαγωγή) inasmuch as both rely on what usually happens, which implies first, that the knowledge to be gained from these procedures is only verisimilar, and second, that such knowledge is inferior inasmuch as it does not lead to a universal conclusion but to a particular one. For John Philoponus, such conclusions lack the desirable quality of necessity, falling short of the standards of demonstrative syllogism and being therefore suitable for rhetorical rather than philosophical use.⁴⁹⁰ Obviously, Palamas from the outset presented demonstrative

Summary: "The Sources of Content and Use of 'ἐπίνοια' in Basil of Caesarea's *Contra Eunomium* 1: Stoicism and Plotinus", *Βυζαντινά* 20 (1999): 7–42, at 18–21.

487 Galen, *De sectis ad eos qui introducuntur* 1, in Georg Helmreich, ed., *Claudii Galeni Pergameni scripta minora*, III (Leipzig: Teubner, 1893), 2, 6–11.

488 Cf. Brochard, *Les sceptiques*, 342–44; 367–68.

489 See, e.g., Ammonius's *In "Isagogen sive Quinque voces"* in Adolf Busse, *Ammonii In Porphyrii Isagogen sive Quinque voces* (CAG IV.3; Berlin: Reimer, 1891), 8, 10–16: "ἀναλογεῖ [...] τῇ ἐπαγωγῇ τὸ παράδειγμα· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκείνη τὸ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ ἔχει καὶ τὸ εἰκός, οὐ πάντως δὲ τὸ ἀληθές, οὕτω καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα. Διαφέρει δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἀλλήλων, ὅτι ἡ μὲν ἐπαγωγή λόγος ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τῶν μερικῶν τὸ καθόλου πιστούμενος, τὸ δὲ παράδειγμα ἀπὸ τῶν μερικῶν τὰ ἐπὶ μέρος πιστοῦται". Barlaam of Calabria, too, warned against drawing conclusions from individual cases (*Contra Latinos A* IV 22, 205–11 in Antonis Fyrigos, ed., *Barlaam Calabro. Opere contro i Latini*, Vols. I–II [Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1998], 572, a passage relying on Aristotle's *Prior Analytics* 46b12–19 and/or some *ad hoc* ancient and/or Byzantine commentaries). Still, Barlaam regarded the edifice of our knowledge of the world as solid (see, e.g., *Contra Latinos A* V 4, 31–33 in Fyrigos, op. cit., 578). On the alleged Scepticism of Barlaam see Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 65–67.

490 John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis "Analytica priora" commentaria*, in Maximilian Wallies, *Ioannis Philoponi in Aristotelis Analytica priora commentaria* (CAG XIII, 2; Berlin:

sylogisms as sharing in the shortcomings of the non-demonstrative ones, so as to make the edifice of science collapse *tout-court*.⁴⁹¹

The set of ancient Greek passages and ideas described above suggests that Palamas was aware that, by calling all disciplines or sciences ‘stochastic,’ he cast radical doubt on their epistemological status in Sceptical terms, which was practically equivalent to dismissing them from the realm of certain truth.

Palamas, in full accordance with Nicephoros Gregoras,⁴⁹² explicitly declares that, in this life, it is absolutely impossible for man to find out the “reasons of beings.”⁴⁹³ Palamas corroborates his repudiation of secular wisdom by appealing, like Gregoras (see above, 360), to the epistemological pessimism of Eccles. 8:17 (quoted above, 348–349), a passage rarely commented upon in Greek Patristics. Yet Palamas, silently reproducing Pseudo-Athanasius of Alexandria’s *Synopsis Scripturae sacrae*,⁴⁹⁴ comments on it with striking nihilism:

de Gruyter, 1905), 34, 12–20: “τὸ ‘ἐξ ἀνάγκης’ (Aristotle, *Prior Analytics* 24b18–19) οὐκ ἔχει.” See also Aristotle, *Rhetorics* 1356b12–23; 1357a13–17; 1357b26–36; 1393a26–27.

491 This negative equation occurs – even with no philosophical background – in some Palamite authors as well; see, e.g., the *Chapters on the Purity of the Soul* 65 (written around 1360) by Callistus I (post 1290?–1364). This author, like Palamas, sharply distinguishes between secular and Christian “contemplation”: “Οἱ γὰρ ἔξω σοφοὶ τεχνικῶς ἢ στοχαστικῶς ὥσανει θεωροῦσι τὰς κινήσεις τῶν ὄντων καὶ πλέον οὐδὲν ἐντεῦθεν πορίζονται, μετρίως δὲ ἐπιβάνουσι καὶ ἀνατείνονται πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ κατανόησιν. Ὁ δὲ τὴν ἐπιστήμην Θεοῦ ὡς εἰκὸς ἐξασκήσας καὶ τὴν θεραπαινίδα ταύτην τῇ ἀληθινῇ σοφίᾳ ὑποτάξας ῥαδίως οἶδε λύειν ‘αἰνίγματα’ (Prov. 1:6) καὶ ‘στροφὰς λόγων’ (Prov. 1:3); ed. Antonio Rigo, “Callisto I Patriarca. *I 100* [109] *capitoli sulla purezza dell'anima*. Introduzione, edizione e traduzione,” *Byzantion* 80 (2010): 333–407, at 378; on the date of the text see 334–335, and on the Evagrian origins of this distinction, 336.

492 Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 88–89; 93; 113–14; 120; 122–3; 311–12; id., “Thomas Aquinas,” 403–405. Cf. *supra*, 358–361.

493 “τοὺς τῆς κτίσεως εὐρηκέναι λόγους . . . , τοῦτο κατὰ τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα [. . .] ἀδύνατον”; “ἀδύνατον παντάπασιν” (Gregory Palamas, *Triads II* 1 41 and 42, in Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, I, 502, 25–28; 503, 25). Palamas, subscribing to a traditional Patristic and Byzantine topos that stems from Philo of Alexandria, accepts the existence of the ‘reasons of beings’ or *παραδείγματα* as eternally pre-existent ‘in the Creator’s Mind,’ i.e., in the second person of the Holy Trinity, and practically identifies them with God’s ‘power/s’ and/or ‘energies’ (see, e.g., *Triads III* 2 24–25, in Chrestou, op. cit., 675, 19–677, 8).

494 Pseudo-Athanasius of Alexandria, *Synopsis Scripturae sacrae* 23 (PG 28, 348C–D): “[The author of *Ecclesiastes*] περὶ τῆς φυσικῆς θεωρίας φιλοσοφῶν φαίνεται. [. . .] Πνεύματι ἀγίῳ κινούμενος, παῖει [. . .] τοὺς ἐπιχειροῦντας περὶ τούτων ζητεῖν, φάσκων. ‘Οὐ δυνήσεται ἄνθρωπος τοῦ εὐρεῖν τὸ ποιήμα τὸ πεποιημένον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον· ὅσα ἂν μοχθήσῃ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ζητῆσαι, καὶ οὐχ εὐρήσει’ (Eccl. 8:17b–c) [. . .] ‘Ὡς ὅσα ἐν γαστρὶ κυοφορούσης, οὕτως οὐ γνώσῃ τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅσα ποιήσει τὰ σύμπαντα’ (Eccles. 11:5b–c). Εἶτα καὶ περὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ἐκάστω γιγνόμενος συνείδεν ὅτι μάτην ἐστὶ περὶ τοιούτων ζητεῖν, καὶ μόνον τὰ τοιαῦτα

Διάφοροι περὶ κτίσεως μὲν εἰσιν οἱ τῶν ἔξωθεν λόγοι, πάντες δ' ὅτι μὴ ἀληθεῖς, εἰσὶν οἱ τούτων ἐπιστήμην συνέθεντο τὴν δεικνύσαν, ὅτι δὲ εἰς τις τῶν διαφερομένων τάληθές αὐχεῖ, οὐδεμία ἐπιστήμη δύναται δεῖξαι ἢ ὅλως ἐπινενόηται. Καὶ τοίνυν ὁ μὴ [...] τῆς ἐν τοῖς κτίσμασι τοῦ Θεοῦ σοφίας τὸ ἀκατάληπτον συνιών, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἔξω σοφίας τὴν διὰ πάντων διικνουμένην ἀλήθειαν ἀκριβῶς κατανοῆσαι οἰόμενος, ἔλαθεν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ 'ψάμμου', μᾶλλον δὲ ἐπ' ἄλλεπαλλήλων κυμάτων⁴⁹⁵ 'τὸν' τῆς γνώσεως 'οἶκον' 'οἰκοδομῶν' (Matth. 7:26), τοσοῦτο πρᾶγμα 'λόγων στροφαῖς'⁴⁹⁶ πιστεύων, αἰεὶ στροφαῖς ἄλλων 'λόγων' πεφυκυῖαις 'καταπαλαίεσθαι'^{497, 498}

The doctrines of Creation by heathen philosophers are in discord with each other; there are, however, some among these philosophers who have made a science that shows that none of these doctrines is true, whereas no science can show or has even conceived of as showing that this or that

μόχθον γεννᾷ. Οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ γινώσκειν τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ πρακτικοῦ βίου ὁ σοφὸς καὶ δίκαιος συνίσταται. Λέγει γάρ· 'Καί γε ὅσα ἂν εἴπη σοφὸς τοῦ γινῶναι, οὐ δυνήσεται τοῦ εὑρεῖν' " (Eccl. 8:17g–h) / "Guided by the Holy Spirit, he shuts up those who embark upon research into these things, saying: 'Man cannot get to the bottom of everything extant under the sun; one may wear himself out in the search, but one will never find it' [...] 'You cannot understand how the embryo grows in a woman's womb: no more can you understand the work of God, the Creator of all.' Furthermore, referring to the examination of each thing separately, he is aware that it is purposeless to investigate them and that the activities of this kind produce only labour. Besides, a man is rendered wise and righteous not out of knowledge of this sort of things, but from the active life. For he says: 'Even if the sage expresses some convincing views, he is nevertheless absolutely incapable of discovering the truth'"). This is just one of the numerous cases of latent Palamite borrowing from Christian and pagan literature. On the apocryphal character of this pseudo-Athanasian writing see Peter Gemeinhardt, "Quellenverzeichnis" in *Athanasius Handbuch*, ed. P. Gemeinhardt (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 465–93, at 471.

495 Cf. Basil of Caesarea, *Quod rebus mundanis adhaerendum non sit* (*Homilia XXI*): "Ποταμός [...] ὁ βίος ἡμῶν, ῥέων ἐνδελεχῶς καὶ κύμασιν ἀλλεπαλλήλοις πληρούμενος. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ προέρρουσεν ἤδη, τὸ δὲ ἔτι πορεύεται· καὶ τὸ μὲν ἄρτι προέκυψε τῶν πηγῶν, τὸ δὲ μέλλει· καὶ πρὸς τὴν κοινὴν ἅπαντες τοῦ θανάτου σπεύδομεν θάλατταν" (PG 31, 561C; cf. John Chrysostom, *Fragmenta in beatum "Job"* PG 64, 568); Pseudo-John Chrysostom, *De jejuniis* III: "Κλύδων τὰ παρόντα καὶ θάλαττα καὶ ἀλλεπάλληλα κύματα καθ' ἐκάστην τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ζάλην ἐγείροντα" (PG 60, 715–16). Obviously, Basil, John Chrysostom, and Pseudo-John Chrysostom regard instability as the distinctive feature of the entire human life in this world. Palamas applies this negative image to a particular activity of man on earth, i.e., his quest for truth.

496 Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration XXXII* 25, 2–7 (see *supra*, 366).

497 See *supra*, 340, n. 308. See also Gregory Palamas, *Triads I*, 1, 1; I, 3, 13 (Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, I, 361, 5–16; 423, 23–28). Cf. Demetracopoulos, *Αὐγουστίνος*, 141–42, n. 143.

498 Gregory Palamas, *Triads II*, 1, 41 in Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, I, 503, 3–19.

heathen philosopher can properly claim to hold the truth. Therefore, he who [...] does not understand the incomprehensibility of the wisdom of God as inherent in the creatures, but thinks that he has fully understood the truth that permeates all of them using as source the pagan wisdom, is unaware of the fact that he 'builds' 'the edifice' of knowledge on 'sand,' or even better, on successive waves, entrusting such a high issue to the dribbles of arguments, which by nature are overturned by the dribbles of other arguments.

The fact that Palamas was pleased with the spirit of a text that has been called 'the Song of Scepticism'⁴⁹⁹ (a text most probably written in mid-3rd or early 2nd century BC) is quite telling. In this Deutero-Canonical book of the Old Testament, the vanity of man's efforts to acquire knowledge is declared and justified in terms of the Edenic curse, and those vain efforts are used as an argument to show the incomprehensibility of God.⁵⁰⁰ Palamas shows himself to be fully aware of the Sceptical tenor of the book, since he argues for its epistemological pessimism by quoting a Sceptical maxim (at second-hand, from Gregory Nazianzen).⁵⁰¹ The *Ecclesiastes*, as the second of the three Old Testament books ascribed to Solomon, was regarded as the one corresponding

499 Charles Henry Hamilton Wright, *The Book of Koheleth, Commonly Called 'Ecclesiastes,' Considered in Relation to Modern Criticism, and to the Doctrines of Modern Pessimism. The Donnellan Lectures for 1880-1* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1883), 137 (the styling of the book as 'the Song of Scepticism' is attributed to the poet Heinrich Heine).

500 Eccles. 7:14; 7:24; 7:28; 8:17; 9:1-11:6. See, e.g., Emile Joseph Dillon, *The Sceptics of the Old Testament: Job - Koheleth - Agur* (London: Isbister, 1895), 40; Robert H. Pfeiffer, "The Peculiar Skepticism of *Ecclesiastes*," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 53.2 (1934): 100-109, at 103-104 and 107; Robert V. McCabe, "The Message of *Ecclesiastes*," *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 1.1 (1996): 85-112, at 94, 97 and 105-109; Roland E. Murphy, "Kohelet der Skeptiker," *Concilium* 12 (1976): 567-70; William H.U. Anderson, *Qoheleth and its Pessimistic Theology: Hermeneutical Struggles in Wisdom Literature* (New York: Mellen Press, 1997), 58-61; Alexander A. Fischer, *Skepsis oder Furcht Gottes? Studien zur Komposition und Theologie des Buches Kohelet* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 238-39; Maria I. Pazarski, "Η έλληγιστικη επιρροη στη σχεψη του 'Εκκλησιαστη'," Ph.D. thesis, University of Thessaloniki, 2006, 136-53 (especially 140-41). Alan Hugh McNeile, *An Introduction to Ecclesiastes, with Notes and Appendices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904), 45 and 52, parallels the core of the message of the *Ecclesiastes* with the spirit of humility in Xenophanes's B34. A partially dissenting voice is that of Jonathan Barnes, who argues ("L'Ecclésiaste et le scepticisme grec," *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 131 [1999]: 103-14) that there is no philosophical (Sceptical or other) spirit in *Ecclesiastes* at all.

501 Gregory Nazianzen, *Carmina moralia* XXXIII, 12 (see *supra*, 340).

to physics. Its *nil expedit* verdict⁵⁰² fully accords with Palamas's account of the grave and insurmountable shortcomings of postlapsarian man. Further, as we have seen (384–391), Palamas regards man's inability to acquire any solid knowledge of the world as evidence for a *fortiori* distrust of στοχάζεσθαι as a method of knowing God through His creatures.⁵⁰³ Although this method supposedly reflects normal human use of the world, namely, to serve as an indication of God's existence and His properties (wisdom, omnipotence, etc.), postlapsarian passions so distorted humans' minds that almost all of them drew erroneous conclusions about God (cf. *supra*, 367–373).⁵⁰⁴

Further, in referring to "some" who have composed a refutation of all philosophical claims on truth, Palamas seems to hint at Sextus Empiricus's writings. Sextus, in *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* II, 9, entitled Εἰ ἔστι τι φύσει ἀληθές ("Does Anything True Really Exist?"), argues that neither 'apparent' nor 'non-evident' 'true things' (i.e. "judgments or propositions which conform to the fact") exist: Οὐδὲν [...] τούτων ἐστὶν ἀληθές, ὡς δεῖξομεν. Οὐδὲν [...] ἄρα ἐστὶν ἀληθές ("None of these alternatives is true, as we shall show; therefore nothing is true").⁵⁰⁵ This position is very close to Palamas's statement that πάντες [...] ὅτι μὴ ἀληθεῖς, εἰσὶν οἱ τούτων ἐπιστήμην συνέθεντο τὴν δεικνύσαν. Apparently, by ἐπιστήμη Palamas refers to Sextus's *Adversus Mathematicos*, a systematic anti-encyclopedia of (Dogmatic) knowledge.⁵⁰⁶

By means of this Sceptical repudiation of normally achieved human knowledge, Palamas paves the way for his doctrine of the knowledge possessed by the 'truly real man'.⁵⁰⁷ Such a man has been lifted by God's grace up to the

502 See Vinel, *Grégoire de Nysse*, 8–9; 50–51. Palamas (*Triads* II, 1, 41, in Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, I, 503, 12–14), ascribes this verdict to the book of *Job*, too, which accords with Olympiodorus's *Commentary on "Job"* (see *supra*, 350).

503 See also Palamas's *Triads* II, 3, 46: "Οὐκέτι [sc. after the Incarnation] ἐκ τοῦ εἰκότος γινώσκομεν τὸν Θεόν· τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν κτισμάτων γνῶσις τοῦ Θεοῦ" (in Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, I, 579, 27–28). As has been seen (377, n. 449), the characterization of man's knowledge of God by means of the creation as 'inferential' or 'speculative' and, in this regard, restricted in value, goes back to Philo of Alexandria.

504 Cf. Demetracopoulos, *Αὐγουστίνος*, 98–100.

505 Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* II, 88 (Mau, *Sexti*, I: 86; tr. Bury, *Sextus*, I: 207).

506 Palamas probably reflects here George Cedrenos's description of Sextus Empiricus's literary production: "ὁ Σέξτος [...] πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀντεῖπε τέχνην καὶ ἐπιστήμην" (*Compendium historiarum*; PG 121, 320B2–3) ("Sextus [...] contradicted every art and science"). This echoes the title of Sextus's *Adversus Mathematicos* as well as of his *Pyrrhonian Outlines* I, 6: "πρὸς ἕκαστον μέρος τῆς καλουμένης φιλοσοφίας ἀντιλέγομεν" (ed. Mau, *Sexti*, I, 5) and *Adversus Mathematicos* I, 96: "πειρασόμεθα πρὸς ἕκαστον ἀντιλέγειν" (ed. Mau, *Sexti*, III, 25).

507 See Demetracopoulos, "Thomas Aquinas," 386.

divine realm; he sees the light of God and pursues within this light what constitutes the 'truly real activity' of man, i.e., gazing upon the high things (i.e. the divine patterns of beings) by means of this light.⁵⁰⁸ The knowledge he gains this way is radically different from what discursive thought (διάνοια) can offer. Discursive thought tries to fly toward truth by means of the wings of the representative faculty, which, like a blind person, runs everywhere in order to grasp things. By nature, the representative faculty fails to grasp with accuracy and certainty the non-present sensible things as well as the intelligible ones.⁵⁰⁹ Obviously, by declaring these syllogistic, epistemological processes ineffective, Palamas repudiates the knowledge that philosophers and scientists try to acquire through ἐπιλογισμός and ἀναλογισμός, respectively (cf. *supra*, 389–390). Further, his combination of this Sceptical repudiation of the ordinary methods of knowledge, on one hand, with the famous Platonic metaphor of the winged soul and her journeys up and down as she tries to reach the realm of being and truth,⁵¹⁰ on the other, stands as a flagrant example of the Late Byzantine trend of Sceptical Platonism (Theodore II Ducas Lascaris, Theodore Metochites, Nicephoros Gregoras et al.). The Late Byzantine Sceptical Platonists put arguments taken from the arsenal of ancient Scepticism in the service of the Platonic and Neoplatonic distrust of sense-experience, thus casting doubt on the very grounds of the edifices of philosophy and science. Furthermore, and quite naturally, since Christians held this stance, it was combined with fideism – on the patristic model of Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa and, above all, Gregory Nazianzen.⁵¹¹ This fideism appears in Palamas, too; to seek God's help, one must first gain a good awareness of one's own quite narrow limits and nearly total ignorance.⁵¹²

508 Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to the Nun Xena* 59, in Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, v, 224, 3–9.

509 Ibid., in Chrestou, op. cit., 224, 10–14: "...διανοίας φανταστικοῖς ἄνεισι πτεροῖς, ἥ πάντα καθάπερ τυφλὴ περιπολεῖ, μήτ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπόντων αἰσθητῶν μήτ' ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπερναβερηκόντων νοητῶν τῆς ἀκριβοῦς καὶ ἀνενδοιάστου καταλήψεως ἀντιλαμβανομένη" / "... it ascends on the wings of the mind's representational faculty, which mind always wanders about as though blind, without possessing an accurate and assured understanding either of the sensible things not immediately present to it of transcendent intelligible realities"; tr. Gerald Eustace Howell Palmer, Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Timothy Ware, *The Philokalia. The Complete Text Compiled by St. Nikodemus of the Holy Mountain and St. Makarios of Corinth*, iv (London: Faber, 1995), 317, slightly revised.

510 Plato, *Phaedrus* 246A3–247E6.

511 Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 84–108; 129–50; 311–12.

512 See, e.g., Gregory Palamas, *Capita* CL 29, 11–14: "ὁ γὰρ γνοὺς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀσθένειαν νοὺς εὗρεν ὅθεν ἂν εἰσέλθοι πρὸς σωτηρίαν καὶ ἐγίσει 'τῷ φωτὶ τῆς γνώσεως' (Os. 10:12) καὶ λάβοι σοφίαν ἀληθῆ καὶ 'τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ' (1 Cor. 3:18; cf. Rom. 12:2) μὴ συγκαταλυμένην (cf. 11 Cor. 5:1)" in

What differentiates Palamas from all of the above Patristic and Byzantine authors is that he does leave room for the postlapsarian human mind to formulate philosophical and scientific theories, but only Christian ones.⁵¹³ Further, following the ‘intellectualist’ strand of Byzantine asceticism,⁵¹⁴ he claims that

ὁ κατηξιωμένος τοῦ φωτὸς ἐκείνου νοῦς καὶ πρὸς τὸ συνημμένον σῶμα πολλὰ διαπορθεύει τοῦ θεοῦ κάλλους τεκμήρια, χάριτί τε θείᾳ καὶ σαρκὸς παχύτητι μεσιτεύων καὶ δύνανται τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἐντιθεῖς. [...] Ἐντεῦθεν ὁ διατρανῶν τοὺς τῶν ὄντων λόγους λόγος καὶ ἀνακαλύπτων οἴκοθεν ἐκ καθαρότητος τὰ τῆς φύσεως μυστήρια, δι’ ὧν “ἀναλογίας” λόγοις πρὸς “κατάληψιν” (Sap. 13:3–5)

Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, v, 51, 7–9 = Robert E. Sinkewicz, ed. and tr., *Saint Gregory Palamas. The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters* (Toronto: PIMS, 1988), 112–13: “For the mind that realizes its own weakness has discovered whence it might enter upon salvation and draw near to ‘the light of knowledge’ and receive true wisdom, which does not pass away with ‘this age.’” Cf. Palamas’s repudiation of man’s natural knowledge of God: “Οὐ πᾶς ὁ τῆν τῶν ὄντων γνώσιν ἔχων ἢ δι’ αὐτῆς ὁρῶν ἔννοικον ἔχει τὸν Θεόν, ἀλλ’ αὐτὴν τὴν γνώσιν τῶν κτισμάτων, ἐξ αὐτῆς ὡς ἐξ εἰκότος στοχαζόμενος Θεόν” (*Triads II* 3 16, in Chrestou, op. cit., 552, 27–31; cf. *Triads II* 3 46: “Οὐκέτι ἐκ τοῦ εἰκότος γινώσκουμεν τὸν Θεόν· τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν κτισμάτων γνώσις τοῦ Θεοῦ” (in Chrestou, op. cit., 579, 27–28). Cf. Sextus Empiricus’s explanation of the word ‘δόκος’ as used in Xenophanes’s B34: “ὥστε κριτήριον γίνεσθαι κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν δοξαστὸν λόγον, τουτέστι τὸν τοῦ εἰκότος ἀλλὰ μὴ τὸν τοῦ παγίου ἔχόμενον” (*Adversus Mathematicos VII*, 1, 10, in Mutschmann, *Sexti*, 11: 25). Cf. Philo of Alexandria, *De specialibus legibus* 1, 60–61: “[...] θύτας, καθαράς, οἰωνοσκόπους, τερατοσκόπους, ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς, κληδόσιν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς, στοχασταὶ γὰρ πάντες οὗτοι πιθανῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλοτε ἄλλας ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν φαντασίας λαμβάνοντες, διὰ τὸ μὴ τε ἀποκείμενα φύσιν ἔχειν πάγιον μήτε τὴν διάνοιαν ἀκριβῆ βάσανον περιπεποιήσθαι, ἢ βασανισθήσεται τὰ δόκιμα” / “[...] Haruspices, purificators, augurs, interpreters of prodigies, incantators, and those who put their faith in sounds and voices. For all these are but guessing at what is plausible and probable, and the same phenomena present to them ideas which differ at different times because the things on which they are based have no natural stability nor has the understanding acquired any accurate touchstone by which the genuine can be tested and approved” (Cohn, *Philonis*, v: 15, 13–18; tr. Colson, *Philo*, VII, 135).

513 See Palamas’s important passage on the possibility of Christian philosophy and science in *Triads II* 1, 23 (Chrestou, I: 485, 33–486, 10). It is in this framework that Palamas undertook the task to refute on rational grounds the heathen *Weltanschauung* depicted in Macrobius’s *Commentary* on Cicero’s *Dream of Scipio*, which was known to him via Maximos Planoudes’s Greek translation of it (see John A. Demetracopoulos, “*Anti-Macrobius Christianus* or the Construction of Christian Science: Gregory Palamas’ *Capita CL* 1–14 (‘De mundo’) as a Christian Refutation of the Heathen Cosmology of Macrobius’ *Commentary on the ‘Dream of Scipio,’* forthcoming).

514 See, e.g., Irénée Hausherr, “Les grands courants de la spiritualité orientale,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 1, 1–2 (1935): 114–38, at 121–24.

τῶν ὑπὲρ φύσιν τὸ διανοούμενον ἀνιμάται τῶν πιστῶς ἀκροωμένων· ἦν αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ λόγου πατὴρ ἀύλοις ἐπαφαίς κατείληφεν. Ἐντεῦθεν αἱ τ' ἄλλαι ποικίλαι θαυματοποιαίαι καὶ τὸ διορᾶν τε καὶ προορᾶν καὶ περὶ τῶν πόρρω που συμβαινόντων ὡς ὑπ' ὀφθαλμοῦς διαλέγεσθαι. Καὶ τὸ δὴ μέγιστον, ὡς οὐ περὶ ταῦθ' ὁ σκοπὸς τείνει τῶν μακαριωτάτων ἐκείνων, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ εἴ τις ὁρῶν πρὸς ἡλιακὴν ἀκτῖνα, καὶ τῶν ἀερίων ἀτόμων αἰσθάνεται, κἂν μὴ τοῦτ' αὐτῷ τυγχάνει σκοπός, οὕτως ἐκείνοις ταῖς θεαῖς ἀκτίσι καθαρῶς ὁμιλοῦσιν, αἷς φύσει πρόσσεστιν ἢ πάντων ἀποκάλυψις, οὐχὶ τῶν ὄντων μόνον ἢ τῶν γεγενημένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἔπειτ' ἐσομένων ὁδοῦ πάρεργον ὡς ἀληθῶς ἢ τούτων προσγίνεται γνῶσις κατ' ἀναλογίαν τῆς καθαρότητος, προὔργου δὲ αὐτοῖς ἢ τοῦ νοὸς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐπιστροφή καὶ σύννευσις, μᾶλλον δὲ πασῶν τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεων, εἰ καὶ θαυμαστὸν εἶπεῖν, πρὸς τὸν νοῦν ἐπιστροφή καὶ ἢ κατ' αὐτὸν τε καὶ Θεὸν ἐνέργεια, δι' ἧς ἐπεσκευασμένοι πρὸς τὸ πρωτότυπον αὐὸ διατίθενται, τὸ “ἀρχαῖον” ἐκεῖνο καὶ ἀμήχανον “κάλλος” ἐπαναγούσης⁵¹⁵ τῆς χάριτος.⁵¹⁶

The intellect that has been accounted worthy of this light also transmits to the body that is united with it many clear tokens of the divine beauty, acting as an intermediary between divine grace and the grossness of the flesh and conferring on the flesh the power to do what lies beyond its power. . . . It is then that the intellect is illumined by the divine Logos who enables it to perceive the inner essences – the logoi – of created things and on account of its purity reveals to it the mysteries of nature. In this way, through relationships of correspondence the perceiving and trusting intelligence is raised up to the apprehension of the supernatural realities – an apprehension that the Father of the Logos communicates through an immaterial union. From this arise various other miraculous effects, such as visionary insight, the seeing of things future, and the experience of things happening afar off as though they were occurring before one's very eyes. But what is more important is that those blessed in this manner do not aspire to attain such powers. Rather it is as though one were to look at a ray of sunlight and at the same time to perceive the small particles in the air, though this was not his intention. So it is with those who commune directly with the rays of divine light, which

⁵¹⁵ John of Damascus, *Homilia in transfigurationem Domini* 11, in Bonifatius Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, V (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988), 449, 6–7.

⁵¹⁶ Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to the Nun Xena* 62, in Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, V, 225, 20–226, 22. Cf. Antonio Rigo, “De l’apologie à l’évocation de l’expérience mystique: Évagre le Pontique, Isaac le Syrien et Diadoque de Photice dans les œuvres de Grégoire Palamas (et dans la controverse palamite),” in *Knotenpunkt Byzanz*, 85–108, at 87–88.

by nature reveal all things: according to the degree of purity they truly attain – albeit as something incidental – a knowledge of what is past, of what is present, and even of what is to come. But their main concern is the return of the intellect to itself and its concentration on itself. Or, rather, their aim is the reconvergence of all the soul's powers in the intellect – however strange this may sound – and the attaining of the state in which both intellect and God work together. In this way they are restored to the original state and assimilated to the Archetype, grace renewing in them their pristine and inconceivable beauty.⁵¹⁷

Palamas's simile of the vision of the sun's rays⁵¹⁸ contrasts sharply with Sextus's simile of the archers who aim at their target in the dark. For Palamas, philosophers have taken great pains to achieve knowledge of the natural world, and yet cannot discern if they have achieved it or not. The Christian saints, in contrast, aiming at knowledge of God, possess knowledge of the natural world effortlessly, as a side benefit.⁵¹⁹

3 *Demetrios Cydones*

In Part I of his *chef-d'œuvre*, the *Defensio S. Thomae Aquinatis adversus Nilum Cabasilam* (probably finished shortly after 1363), Demetrios Cydones (1324/25–1397) explained the epistemological status of man in this life by carefully adapting one of Sextus Empiricus's two illustrations of Xenophanes's B34; he who searches for truth in this life, Demetrios says:

searches in the same way as a blind man, who wanders here and there in a house and, when searching for something of the things lying inside, cannot, because of his disability, move directly towards it; instead, he first

517 Tr. Palmer et al., *The Philokalia*, v, 318–19.

518 This simile probably derives from Proclus's *In Platonis "Parmenidem"* II: "ὥσπερ εἰ λέγοι τις, καθὼς ἀήρ, κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ φῶς, καὶ καθὼς φῶς, κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἀήρ. Ἐστω δὲ πεφωτισμένος ἀήρ, καὶ οὔτε ὁ ἀήρ φῶς, οὔτε τὸ φῶς ἀήρ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ φωτὶ ὁ ἀήρ, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀέρι τὸ φῶς, διότι παρακειμένων ἀλλήλοις τῶν μορίων τοῦ τε ἀέρος καὶ τοῦ φωτός, οὐδὲν ἐστὶ λαβεῖν θατέρου τούτων καθ' ὃ μὴ θεωρεῖται καὶ τὸ λοιπόν" (ed. Carlos G. Steel, *Procli in Platonis Parmenidem commentaria. Tomus I libros I–III continens* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007], 162 = 755, 25–756, 3 *juxta* Cousin).

519 Palamas's depreciation of στοχασμός as a means to knowledge of God on behalf of experience was reproduced by some of his followers; see, e.g., Philotheos Kokkinos, *Against Nicephoros Gregoras* x, 459–60 ("... πείρα... μαθόντες, καὶ οὐ λόγοις ἀπλῶς οὐδὲ στοχασμοῖς"; ed. Demetrios B. Kaimakes, *Φιλοθέου Κοκκίνου δογματικά ἔργα. Μέρος Α'* [Thessaloniki: Aristotle University Center for Byzantine Studies, 1983], 377).

grasps a thing he happens to know, then another and another, till he reaches what he was actually searching for.⁵²⁰

In contrast to the core of Sextus's simile of some persons who are objectively unable to make sure if what they touch upon in a dark house is the jewelry they are looking for or not, Demetrios deems his blind man, for all the objective difficulties, able to reach, step by step, his end. These steps are the stages of discursive thought, which Sextus regarded ineffective. "So, it seems that Demetrius's 'blind' yet mentally energetic 'man' was meant to stand as his response to the revival of Scepticism in his time."⁵²¹ Demetrios was a moderate optimist. This is reflected in his views on the major ecclesiastical problem of his age, i.e. the union of the Churches of Rome and Constantinople, as well as on the major theological debate of his age, i.e. the debate on Palamism.

3.1 Cydones on His Own Placement in the East-West Tug of War, or on One's Right to Have a Moderate Trust in One's Own Mind

Cydones's moderate optimism becomes apparent in the way he assimilates another well-known simile, i.e., that used in Plato's *Phaedo* 85D1–4 (see *supra*, 263). Demetrios, addressing the Orthodox ecclesiastical leaders, who were by then in conflict with the Latins, in main as far as Trinitarian theology was concerned, writes:

... Προσήκον ἂν εἴποίμι ἀνδράσι σοφοῖς καὶ τοῦ γένους ὅλου προβεβλημένοις μὴ ὥσπερ τινὶ σαθρῷ καὶ ἔρρωγῳτὶ πλοίῳ ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς τε καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους "πιστεύοντας" τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας πέλαγος πειρᾶσθαι διαπερᾶν, ὥσπερ δὲ εἷς τινα ναὺν ἀρραγὴ τε καὶ ὑγιή "τὴν πίστιν" ἐμβαίνοντας ἐπὶ ταῖς παραδεδομέναις ἡμῖν Γραφαῖς ὥσπερ "ἐφ' ἱερᾶς ἀγκύρας" ὁρμεῖν,⁵²² ἀντὶ δὲ κελευστῶν ὑπακούειν τοῖς τὸ πέλαγος τοῦτο προδιαβάσιν ἀγίοις ἡμῶν πατρᾶσι καὶ διδασκάλοις καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνους ὁρῶντας καὶ ἡμᾶς ποιεῖσθαι τὸν πλοῦν, "προκαλεῖσθαι"⁵²³ δὲ καὶ

520 Demetracopoulos, "Thomas Aquinas's," 370.

521 *Art. cit.*, 370–72.

522 John Chrysostom, *Ad populum Antiochenum* XXI, 1 (PG 49, at 212); *De Anna* V, 3 (PG 54, 672); *In "Epistulam I ad Thessalonicenses"* VII, 3 (PG 62, 440); *In "Epistulam I ad Timotheum"* XII, 1 (PG 62, 558).

523 Cf. Basil of Caesarea, *Epistle cxxviii*, 3, 1–9 in Courtonne, ed., *Saint Basile. Lettres*, II, 39: "Οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ παντελῶς μοι δοκεῖ τῶν μὴ δεχομένων τὴν πίστιν ἁλλοτριοῦν ἑαυτοὺς, ἀλλὰ ποιήσασθαι τινα τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐπιμέλειαν κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς θεσμούς τῆς ἀγάπης . . . καὶ τὴν τῶν Πατέρων πίστιν προτεινομένους προκαλεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς εἰς συνάφειαν· κὰν μὲν πείσωμεν, κοινῶς αὐτοῖς ἐνωθῆναι, ἐὰν δὲ ἀποτύχωμεν, ἀρκεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς ἀλλήλοις, τὸν δὲ ἐπαμφοτερισμὸν τοῦτον ἐξορίσαι τοῦ ἥθους . . .". The difference is that, to Cydones, the 'others' are not just would-be

τοὺς ἄλλους λέγειν ὅτι τις ἔχει πρὸς τὴν πορείαν ταύτην συντείνον... , πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν μόνην καὶ τὸν ἐν αὐτῇ λιμένα καὶ τὴν τῶν λογισμῶν γαλήνην ἀποσκοποῦντας ἐπείγεσθαι. Οὕτω δὲ ἡμᾶς παρεσκευασμένους πείθομαι ἢ τῆς ἀληθείας μὴ ἀμαρτήσεσθαι, ἥς οὐδὲν μείζον ἀνθρώποις γένοιτ' ἂν τῶν πολλῶν πόνων ἄθλον, ἢ τὸν γοῦν μάλιστ' ἀνεξέλεγκτον λόγον πορισσάμενους,⁵²⁴ τοῦτον μετρίαν ἔξιν ἀπολογίαν "ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ" (II Cor. 5:10), ὅταν τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀμαρτεῖν ἀπαιτῶμεθα δίκας· ἀκχείνος γὰρ ἴσως συγγνώσεται, οὐδὲν ἡμᾶς τῆς δυνάμεως ἐλλειπτότας εὐρών, ὅτι μὴδ' αὐτοὶ τὰ τὴν δύναμιν "ὑπερβαίνοντα" τοῖς ἀνθρώποις "νομοθετεῖ" ἢ ἀπαιτεῖ (cf. Matth. 11:30).⁵²⁵

What I think it would be proper to suggest to wise men, who are the leaders of the entire nation, is this. Don't try to cross the sea of truth 'entrusting' yourselves and others to some, so to speak, rotten and wrecked ship; you should rather embark upon 'faith' as if upon a solid and sound ship, holding on the Scriptures that have been delivered to us as if 'on a sacred anchor'; further, we should obey our holy Fathers and doctors, who have already crossed this sea, as if they were petty officers, and make this travel by looking at them. At the same time, we should 'ask' the others to say to us whatever might be conducive to our travel... and keep steadfast to the task of reaching the pure truth, the harbor which lies in its blossom and the peace of mind [that lies there]. If we prepare ourselves in this way, I am confident that either we will not fail to find the truth, in comparison to which there is no superior prize for one's hard labours, or, at least, we will find out whatever doctrine is hardest to disprove and use it as a sufficient apology 'before the court of Christ,' when we will be accused of having fallen short of truth; and He, for His own part, will presumably

convinced persons, but persons who can make their own contribution to one's search for truth.

524 See also his *Religious Testament*, in Giovanni Mercati, ed., *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV* (Studi e Testi 56; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1931), 428, 84: "... τῆς δυνάτης γοῦν περὶ τῶν θεῶν ἀληθείας μὴ ἀμελεῖν..." (cf. Plato, *Phaedo* 85C4–6 and 8–9: "... περὶ τῶν τοιούτων [sc. the divine things]... ἀδύνατον... Μὴ προαφίστασθαι... Τὸν γοῦν βέλτιστον τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων λόγων...").

525 Demetrios Cydones, *To the Patriarch Philotheos* (in Mercati, *Notizie*, 384, 81–98). The words which constitute selfsame or adapted borrowings from Plato's *Phaedo* 85C–D are underlined. The sources of the concluding sentence of the passage ("ὅτι...") must be John Chrysostom's *Catecheses ad illuminandos* VII, 13, 1–2 (in Antoine Wenger, ed., *Jean Chrysostome. Huit catéchèses baptismales* [sc 50 bis; Paris: Cerf, 1970]) and *Ad populum Antiochenum* XIII, 3 (PG 49, 140).

forgive us, because He will see that we had done our best, since what He ‘commands’ us or demands from us does not ‘exceed’ humans’ powers.

At first glance, Demetrios is quite traditional here; using a vocabulary that, for its greatest part, can be traced back to John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea, he holds that for a Byzantine religious to be a good Christian, it suffices to be firmly based on the Scriptures as interpreted by the Greek doctors of the Church. Still, he continues, one must also ask “the others” (i.e. the Latins) for their opinion, since they, too, can make their own contribution to one’s task of finding out the Christian truth. What is this process supposed to result in? One would either hit upon the target or get as close as possible to it. Cydones implies that there is no way for us to discern whether we have really got the truth or not; this echoes exactly the core of Xenophanes’s B34 as reflected in the opening sentence of Plato’s *Phaedo* 85C–D. Cydones simply says that it is sufficient to do our best in this direction by following what seems to be the best *human* doctrine of the divine matters and that, if it happens that one errs (which is quite possible), God would presumably prove merciful to him, because He is not so unjust as to demand from us humans something that, because of our very nature, lies beyond our reach. This is clearly an adoption of Xenophanes’s stress of the limited character of the human knowledge of the divine matters, yet coloured by a tone of Platonic optimism, which is ostensibly expressed by means of Platonic wording.

3.2 Cydones’s Anti-Palamism, or on the Cognitive Limits of the Human Nature

Cydones, in another writing, addresses the staunch defender of Palamism, Philotheos Kokkinos (1295/97–1379, Patriarch of Constantinople from 1353 to 1354 and 1364 to 1377), whom he bitterly accuses of following a person who resembles the ridiculous Aristophanic Socrates (*Clouds*, 250; see *supra*, 257), namely, Gregory Palamas:

Λέγε δὲ τὸν ἀληθῆ σου διδάσκαλον, ἐκεῖνον “τὸν ἀλαζόνα”,⁵²⁶ τὸν “μετεωροφένακα”,⁵²⁷ ὃς “κρεμάσας τὸ νόημα καὶ τὴν φροντίδα, λεπτὴν εἰς τὸν ὁμοῖον ἐγκαταμίξας ἀέρα”,⁵²⁸ ὑφηγητῆς ὑμῖν γέγονε τῶν καλῶν τούτων

526 Aristophanes, *Clouds* 102, 449 and 1492, in Dover, *Aristophanes*, 12, 31 and 87.

527 Id., op. cit. 333; cf. 228 (in Dover, op. cit., 24; 18).

528 Id., 229–30 in Dover, op. cit., 18. Gregory Acindynos was the first to express irony against Palamas by using a verse from this comedy (v. 153: “τῆς λεπτότητος τῶν φρενῶν!” / “What subtlety of mind!”) (Gregory Acindynos, *Refutatio magna operis Gregorii Palamae cui*

δογμάτων. Ἐκεῖθεν γάρ σοι ἡ τῶν φώτων λατρεία καὶ τὸ τῶν “θεῶν σμήνος”⁵²⁹ καὶ ὁ τῶν θεοτήτων⁵³⁰ ὁρμαθὸς καὶ τὰ “ὑφειμένα” καὶ “ὑπερκειμένα”⁵³¹ ἄκτιστα καὶ τὰ νῶ καταληπτὰ καὶ ἀκατάληπτα καὶ ὁρατὰ καὶ ἀόρατα καὶ ὁ “ἄναρχος” καὶ “ἄκτιστος”⁵³² σὺ [...] καὶ ὁ πράγματι καὶ ἀληθεῖα Θεὸς διὰ τὴν μέθεξιν τῆς ὑφειμένης Θεότητος, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς πράγματι καὶ ἀληθεῖα ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἡ φυσικὴ εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ’ οὐ κατὰ μίμησιν οὐδὲ σχέσιν, καὶ τὰ “μυρίων σκηπτῶν ἄξια”.⁵³³ ... Τῆς δίκης ... σοῦ τὴν ὑπερηφάνειαν ἐλεγχούσης καὶ ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ὢν ἴσον σεαυτὸν ποιεῖς τῷ Θεῷ ...⁵³⁴

Reveal the real mentor of yours, i.e., that ‘arrogant man,’ the ‘man of highflown pretension,’ who, “suspending his mind and commingling his rarefied thought with its kindred air,” introduced you to these good doctrines. It was from him that you derived the adoration of the lights, the “swarm of gods” and the bunch of deities and the inferior and superior uncreated realities and the things that can or cannot be understood by mind and the visible and invisible and what is uncreated and without beginning, like you ... and the really and truly God because of his participation in the inferior Deity, just as Christ is really and truly man,

titulus “Dialogus inter Orthodoxum et Barlaamitam” 111, 6, 25–26 and IV, 38, 36–37, in Juan Nadal Cañellas, ed., *Gregorii Acindyni opera. Refutationes duae operis Gregorii Palamae cui titulus “Dialogus inter Orthodoxum et Barlaamitam”* [CCSG 31; Turnhout: Brepols, 1995], 174 and 375; see also id., *La théodicée de Grégoire Palamas à la lumière de la théologie orthodoxe traditionnelle*, forthcoming).

- 529 Aristophanes, *Clouds* 297, in Dover, *Aristophanes*, 22.
 530 Cf. Id., op. cit. 265; 316; 365, in Dover, op. cit., 20; 23; 26.
 531 See, e.g., Gregory Palamas, *3rd Epistle to Acindynos* 7; 15 (ed. Meyendorff in *Γρηγορίου*, I: 301, 9–11; 306, 18–20). Cf. Demetracopoulos, “Palamas Transformed,” 277, n. 37.
 532 See, e.g., Gregory Palamas, *3rd Epistle to Acindynos* 16, in Chrestou, *Γρηγορίου*, I, 308, 11–309, 24.
 533 A favorite phrase of John Chrysostom; the only relevant passage is the *De incomprehensibili Dei natura* 11, 371–73 (ed. Anne-Marie Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome. Sur l’incompréhensibilité de Dieu. Homélies I–V* [SC 28^{bis}; Paris: Cerf, 1970; 2000], 172): “Σὺ δὲ τὴν μακαρίαν αὐτὴν οὐσίαν ... πολυπραγμονῶν, οὐχ ἡγῆ ἄξιος εἶναι μυρίων σκηπτῶν;”.
 534 Demetrios Cydones, *To the Patriarch Philotheos* (in Mercati, *Notizie*, 303, 28–38). See also Demetrios Cydones’s description of the Palamites (*Epistle xxxi*, 68–69) as “θεόληπτοι καὶ ἐπίπνοι, καὶ πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ ἄνθρωποι” (“men who pass themselves for divine-possessed and God-inspired, but are in fact whatever except for human beings ...” [i.e. in fact, something less than humans, i.e., irrational beings] (in Raymond-Joseph Loenertz, ed., *Démétrius Cydonès. Correspondance*, I [Studi e Testi 186; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1956], 62). Cf. Aristotle, *Ethica Eudemia* 1214a22–24: “καθάπερ οἱ ... θεόληπτοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐπιπνοῖα δαιμονίου τινὸς ὥσπερ ἐνθουσιάζοντες ...”

and the natural image of God, which is not an image of His by means of imitation or in terms of relation, and those ideas that deserve thousands of thunders . . . Punishment . . . chastises your arrogance and the fact that, although you are a human being, you make yourself equal to God . . .

Cydonos does not expressly include Aristophanes's paraphrase of Xenophanes's B34 (. . . τὰ θεῖα πράγματ' εἰδέναι σαφῶς ἅττ' ἐστίν . . . ; see *supra*, 257). Still, the fragment is latent in this passage. Cydonos's paratactic enumeration of the Palamite errors about the divine consists of five bits: (1) ἡ τῶν φώτων λατρεία; (2) τὸ τῶν θεῶν σμῆνος καὶ ὁ τῶν θεοτήτων ὁρμαθός (hendiadys); (3) τὰ ὑφειμένα καὶ ὑπερκείμενα ἄκτιστα; (4) τὰ νῶ καταληπτὰ καὶ ἀκατάληπτα καὶ ὁρατὰ καὶ ἀόρατα (hendiadys); (5) ὁ ἀναρχος καὶ ἄκτιστος καὶ ὁ πράγματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ Θεὸς διὰ τὴν μέθεξιν τῆς ὑφειμένης Θεότητος, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς πράγματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἡ φυσικὴ εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' οὐ κατὰ μίμησιν οὐδὲ σχέσιν. Item (1) refers to the peculiar affection of the Palamite monks for the 'divine light' as the way God reveals Himself to them. Item (2) refers, in Aristophanic words, to the multitude of the divine energies, compared with the Socratic deities, i.e. the Clouds, whom Socrates makes appear before mortals by means of invocation.⁵³⁵ Item (3) refers to Palamas's real distinction between the divine essence and energies, whereas item (4) refers to the Palamite definition of the essence as His incomprehensible and inaccessible aspect, in contrast to the divine energies, which are defined as His comprehensible and accessible aspect. Items (3) and (4) (τὰ . . . καὶ τὰ . . . etc.), which summarize Palamas's doctrine of the divine realities, look like an elaboration of the Aristophanic Socrates's τὰ θεῖα, arrogantly held by Palamas, in direct contrast with the message of the Xenophanean B34, as perfectly known to himself, Palamas. Item (5) refers to the alleged, unnaturally real deification of the Palamites by means of participating in the divine energies.⁵³⁶

Now, the last bit of the parataxis of the enumerated Palamite errors reads: τὰ μυρίων σκηπτῶν ἄξια. This clause does not add anything; it is just a pejorative recapitulation of all the preceding points. Still, we should not fail to notice that John Chrysostom had used this very phrase in his celebrated homilies, *De incomprehensibili Dei natura*, in order to emphasize how absurd it is

535 Aristophanes, *Clouds* 269–91; 299–313, in Dover, *Aristophanes*, 21–22. We are probably meant to recall the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century hesychastic prayer, which was supposed to elevate man to the divine realm.

536 See, e.g., Gregory Acindynos, *Refutatio* IV, 1, in Nadal Cañellas, *Gregorii*, 314–16. Cf. Nadal Cañellas, *La théodicée*, forthcoming.

for man to scrutinize the divine nature.⁵³⁷ The quotation from Chrysostom implies that, to Cydones, Xenophanes's and Chrysostom's calls for modesty in our quest for the divine truths match perfectly.

To Cydones, the distance between man and God, at least in this life, is unbridgeable. Human knowledge of God is knowledge from a distance. He who, like Gregory Palamas, pretends to go beyond the limits imposed by the human condition is just as ridiculous as the Aristophanic Socrates who, in his unbounded temerity, promised everybody clear knowledge of the divine things. In accusing Palamas of trying to transgress the limits of human nature and the human condition, Cydones aligned himself with an anti-Palamite critique expressed by Barlaam the Calabrian, Gregory Acindynos, Nicephoros Gregoras, and John Cyparissiotis as well as by some modern theologians.⁵³⁸ The peculiar element in Demetrios Cydones's stance is that he described Palamas's arrogantly cataphatic theology by means of Xenophanes's Scepticism and Aristophanes's caricature of Socrates's philosophy.

4 *Manuel II Palaiologos*

4.1 Religious Anti-Scepticism

Manuel II Palaiologos (1350–1425) had been a disciple of Demetrios Cydones. In one of his major writings, the *Dialogue with a Certain Persian, who Held the Office of Muterizes, in Ankara of Galatia* (written shortly before 1400), Manuel tries to convert his Muslim interlocutor, Haci Bayram Velî (1339/40 or 1352–1429),⁵³⁹ to Christianity by means of various arguments, including some purely rational ones. At the end of Dialogue VIII and the beginning of Dialogue IX, as Manuel is getting close to convincing the Muterizes about the triunity of God, he must face the 'Persian's' last resistance, expressed by means of an impressive legend, otherwise unknown to me, called the 'Golden Column':

Λίαν ἀληθές μοι δοκεῖ τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν θρυλούμενον . . . Φασὶ μὴδένα [2; 3; 6] σαφῶς [1] ἐπίστασθαι {7}, εἰ ὑγιὲς τὸ σέβας αὐτῷ παντάπασιν ὃν τυγχάνει καὶ τοῦ τῶν

537 See *supra*, n. 533. Demetrios Cydones composed a five-line *Encomium for John Chrysostom* and often expressed his admiration for Chrysostom (Mercati, *Notizie*, 157–58; cf. Franz Tinnefeld, *Demetrius Kydones. Briefe. Übersetzt und erläutert*, 1, 1 [Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1981], 67).

538 See references to sources and bibliography in Demetracopoulos, "Palamas Transformed," 274–76; id., *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 105–107; id., *The Christian Platonism of Barlaam the Calabrian* (forthcoming); Nadal Cañellas, *La théodicée* (forthcoming).

539 On the identification of this person, see Michel Balivet, "Le sufi et le basileus: Haci Bayram Velî et Manuel II Paléologue," *Medioevo Greco* 4 (2004): 19–30, at 29–30.

ἄλλων ὑπέρκειται· νομίζει μὲν γὰρ ἕκαστος ὡς ἄρα μόνος αὐτὸς τὸν χρυσοῦν κατέχει κίονα, Θεὸς δὲ μόνος οἶδε τὰληθές, ἄνθρωποι {4} δὲ πάντες [15] {3; 6} δόξαις ἀμφιβόλοις {14} στηριζόμεθα... Νυκτὶ τὸν βίον εἰκοῦτα τὸν ἐνταυθοῖ (cf. Plato, *Phaedo* 85C2) καὶ ἡμᾶς μὴδὲν ἐπισταμένους {7} ἀκριβῶς {1} περὶ τῶν θεῶν πραγμάτων [8; 10]. [...] Τίς γὰρ πάντων [15] {3; 6} ἐπίσταται {7}, εἰ τῷ ὀρθῷ καὶ ἀληθεστάτῳ λόγῳ παντάπασιν ἔπεται (cf. Plato, *Phaedo* 85D1) καὶ οὐ διαμαρτάνει καθ' ὅτιοι, πιστεύων μὲν εἰς Θεόν..., εἰς ὃν δὲ πάντως οὐχ ἑώρακεν οὐδ' ἔγνωκεν ἀκριβῶς; Καλὸν ἄρα... τὴν λαμπάδα περιμένειν ἐκείνην τὴν ἄσβεστον τε καὶ ἄπαυστον, ἣ τοῖς πάντων ὀφθαλμοῖς τὰ νῦν ἀμφιγνοούμενα δείξει τοσοῦτο κρεῖττον καὶ καθαρώτερον ἢ νῦν ἡμῖν δοξάζεται, ὅσον γε καὶ προῦχεν προσήκε κόσμου θνητοῦ τὸν ἀθάνατον. Ἄρ' ἔστι τῶν ἐνδεχομένων... ὄντινόν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βέβαιον παντάπασιν εἶναι περὶ τὴν πίστιν καὶ ὡς ὁ νόμος αὐτῷ... μόνος ἀληθείας κανὼν καὶ "ὁδός" καὶ "γέφυρα" καὶ "κλίμαξ"⁵⁴⁰ καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα, οἷς γε μόνοις ἔνεστι τῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς τυχεῖν ἀγαθῶν; Ἀκούω μὲν γὰρ σου λέγοντος τοῦτο – καὶ μέντοι καὶ πιθανοῖς αὐτῷ βεβοήθηκας λόγοις –, πολλοῦ δὲ τέως δέω πεισθῆναι, ὡς ἐνὶ τοῦτ' εἰδέναι [7] σαφῶς {1}, πρᾶγμα μὴ βλεπόμενον μὴδὲ γινωσκόμενον καθαρῶς πρὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, ἣ δὴ πάντα δείξει γυμνὰ μὴδενὶ προβλήματι καλυπτόμενα. Τότε εἰσόμεθα [7] τὰληθές {1}, τὰ δὲ ταυτησί τῆς ἡμέρας ἅπαντα σκότος πρὸς τὴν ἀνέσπερον ἐκείνην παρατιθέμενα...

I think that a legend that [...] nowadays circulates in our country speaks the truth. [...] Nobody knows clearly if his own religious convictions are absolutely sane and superior to the convictions held by others. Each person thinks that he is the only one to have grasped the 'golden column'; as a matter of fact, however, only God knows truth, whereas all of us, human beings, rely upon doubtful opinions... This life is like the darkness of night and... we actually know nothing concrete of things divine. [...] For who of the entire population on earth knows for sure that he

540 Comparisons used for the disciplines as means of reaching the metaphysical truths; see Ammonius, *In Porphyrii "Isagogen sive Quinque Voces"* in Adolf Busse, *Ammonius. In Porphyrii*, 10, 22–23; 13, 4–6; David, *Prolegomena philosophiae*, in Adolf Busse, *Davidis Prolegomena et In Porphyrii Isagogen commentarium* (CAG XVIII, 2; Berlin: Reimer, 1904), 59, 19–23; Simplicius or Priscianus Lydus, *In Aristotelis libros "De anima" commentaria*, in Michael Hayduck, *Simplicii in liāros Aristotelis de anima commentaria* (CAG XI; Berlin: Reimer, 1882), 276, 35; Michael Psellus, *Oratoria minora* XVIII, 37–47, in Littlewood, *Michaelis Pselli*, 66–67; George Pachymeres, *Quadrivium* I, in Paul Tannery, *Quadrivium de Georges Pachymère ou Σύνταγμα τῶν τεσσάρων μαθημάτων, ἀριθμητικῆς, μουσικῆς, γεωμετρίας καὶ ἀστρονομίας*, rev. Elpidios Stéphanou (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1940), 12, 13–15.

follows without even the slightest error whatsoever the right and absolutely true reasoning and that he commits no error at all, since the case is that he (rightly, of course) believes in God . . . but has neither definitely seen nor exactly known what the God he believes in is? In fact, how could we clearly know Him, Who lies beyond any comprehension . . . ? It would be therefore advisable [. . .] to wait for the inextinguishable and everlasting torch, which will render for everybody the things now disputed as much better and clearer than we now see them, as the world of immortality is by nature superior to that of mortality. [. . .] Is it objectively possible for someone to be absolutely certain about his beliefs and that his own faith is the only rule of truth or way or bridge or ladder *et sim.*, by means of which alone can one reach the celestial goods? For I am listening to you saying – and, indeed, arguing for your beliefs by means of persuasive arguments – that it is objectively possible to know with clarity that which can neither be seen nor be known before that day which will reveal everything naked, namely, covered by no curtain. It is then that we will know the truth, whereas whatever belongs to the present day is dark if compared to that never-failing day . . .⁵⁴¹

As has been shown elsewhere,⁵⁴² between this simile and Sextus's illustration (as alluded to by Demetrios Cydonēs; see *supra*, 398) there are numerous striking – even verbal – similarities. Note particularly that Muterizes's wording (as reported by Manuel, of course)⁵⁴³ is almost identical to Arius Didymus's positive paraphrase of Xenophanes's B34: . . . ὡς ἄρα Θεὸς μὲν οἶδε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, 'δόκος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται' (see *supra*, 283). Muterizes is presented as closely reproducing Xenophanes's contrast between God and men (Xenophanes: Θεὸς *vs.* πᾶσι or τίς ἀνὴρ; Muterizes: Θεὸς *vs.* ἄνθρωποι πάντες or ἕκαστος). Further, Muterizes uses σαφῶς/σαφές⁵⁴⁴ and ἀληθές (τὴν ἀλήθειαν in Didymus) as equivalent to each other, as implied in Arius Didymus's quotation of B34 (Didymus's τὴν ἀλήθειαν corresponds to τὸ σαφές in v. 1, which Didymus does not quote). As

541 Erich Trapp (ed.), *Manuel II. Palaiologos. Dialoge mit einem "Perser"* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1966), 102, 42–103, 6; 103, 37–38; 104, 3–10; 106, 34–107, 1; see also *op. cit.*, 105, 4.

542 Demetracopoulos, "Pope Benedict XVI's Use," 292–3.

543 To my knowledge, no study exists of the way Manuel might have transformed his historical dialogue with Muterizes into a literary composition. As far as I can guess, Manuel, in rephrasing Muterizes's pious Scepticism by means of Xenophanes *apud* Arius Didymus, nationalistically fit his interlocutor's thought into the mold of the Greek intellectual tradition. Still, this is not to say that he altered the core of Muterizes's argument, even unconsciously.

544 See also Trapp, *Manuel*, 104, 6.

for the epistemological level of human beliefs about matters as much debated as the things divine, Muterizes uses the word *δοξάζεται*, which is not only akin to *δόκος* but also identical to *δεδοξάσθω* in B35 (see *supra*, 261), itself explicitly quoted as Xenophanean and applied to a discussion about the Muses by that best-seller in Late Byzantium, Plutarch.⁵⁴⁵ Moreover, Muterizes explicitly applies the God-man contrast to the divine things (*περὶ τῶν θεῶν πραγμάτων*),⁵⁴⁶ which reflects B34, v. 2 (*ἀμφὶ θεῶν*). Last, Muterizes, by stressing the disadvantages of the *humana conditio*, intended to warn his Christian interlocutor against *μέγα φρονεῖν* ('to be arrogant'), *κατεπαίρεσθαι* ('to be boastful'), *θαρρεῖν ἑαυτῷ* ('to be over-confident in oneself') and *προπετεῖς τοὺς λογισμοὺς ἔχειν* ('to have presumptuous beliefs') and to suggest that he should "be a man of moderate opinions" (*μετριάζειν*).⁵⁴⁷ This moral coincides with an idea ascribed to Xenophanes by Arius Didymus (or his lost source): Xenophanes, we are told, by acknowledging the limits of human knowledge of the divine, avoided the audacity with which others propounded their views (see *supra*, 284).⁵⁴⁸

Manuel rejected the 'Golden Column' argument on the grounds that being in doubt and holding firm religious beliefs are mutually exclusive. Despite human ignorance of many things about both God and created beings, and regardless of the superiority of the knowledge that God will grant us in the life to come, certainty about what one does believe in this life to be the truth revealed by God is a *conditio sine qua non* for the very existence of faith in one's soul.⁵⁴⁹ 'Faith,' for Manuel, is superior not only to 'opinion' but even to 'knowledge.'⁵⁵⁰ Further, natural reason helps us to discover some fundamental truths about the divine as well as to discern which of the various religions stands as the real revelation of God to man. What caused Muterizes's refuge

545 Plutarch of Chaeronea, *Quaestiones convivales* 747B5–7. See Leshner, *Xenophanes of Colophon*, 39; 169–76.

546 Trapp, *Manuel*, 103, 38.

547 Trapp, op. cit., 103, 40–42; 104, 7.

548 Muterizes states his position that truth is going to be plainly known in the future life ('Τότε εἰσόμεθα τὰληθέες') in a way closely similar to Socrates's words in Plato's *Phaedo* ('ἔχετε ἐλθόντες τὸ σαφὲς εἰσόμεθα'; see *supra*, 264; see also Muterizes's contrast between the 'mortal' and 'immortal world,' in Trapp, *Manuel*, 104, 10). Still, Muterizes's position – that there is practically no way to distinguish between truth and falsehood in the existing beliefs about God – was so relativistic that, for all its charming modesty, Socrates and Plato would hardly have accepted it.

549 See Demetracopoulos, "Pope Benedict XVI's Use," 300–301.

550 Manuel II Palaiologos, *Dialogue with a Certain Persian, Who Held the Office of Muterizes, in Ankara of Galatia*, IX (in Trapp, op. cit., 105, 12–13).

in religious Scepticism was Manuel's rational argument for the existence of God the Logos as begotten by God the Father and by God the Spirit as proceeding from God the Father.⁵⁵¹ Manuel, in this argument, was following a traditional line that started with Gregory of Nyssa and ended (through John of Damascus, Euthymius Zygabenus, et al.) in his own century, e.g., in Gregory Palamas's discussion with the Muslim Chionai.⁵⁵² *In foro externo*, Manuel II Palaiologos discarded Scepticism; and, in writing down his dialogue with an erudite Muslim, he grasped the opportunity to reject Scepticism as expressed in Xenophanes's B34 as well as in the allegedly 'pious' version of it expressed in Arius Didymus's report of Xenophanes's fragment. Manuel's position is in full accord with Palamas's means of coping with Xenophanes's Scepticism (see *supra*, 368–369). And, since Manuel, a professed Palamite, had used – with some caution – Palamas's writings on other occasions,⁵⁵³ it is quite plausible to think that he was self-consciously subscribing to Palamas's repudiation of both Xenophanes's Scepticism and alleged Sceptically-based piety. In doing so, Manuel defended Palamas's theological anti-Scepticism against the right-wing attack on it by many 14th century anti-Palamite thinkers (cf. *supra*, 404, § 3), including his own mentor, Demetrios Cydones.

4.2 Religious Distrust of the Human Knowledge of God

Still, *in foro interno*, Manuel takes a different stand.⁵⁵⁴ As he argues at length in paragraph 10 of his important *Epistula ad dominum Alexium Iagoup*,⁵⁵⁵ the very construction of human nature imposes on it certain strict limits that make it impossible for us to grasp what the unique infinite being is. That is why it was necessary for man to be taught the truth by means of God's very presence, so that some truths could be disseminated by a restricted number of persons selected for this task. But even so, Manuel continues, God remained just as unknown; for it is only in comparison to the humans not selected (τῇ πρὸς τοὺς ὁμογενεῖς παραθέσει / “in comparison to his [sc. St. Paul's] fellow-men”)⁵⁵⁶

551 Manuel II Palaiologos, *Dialogue* VIII (Trapp, op. cit., 102, 24–38).

552 Gregory Palamas, *A Discussion with Chionai* 5–6 in Basileios D. Phanourgakes, ed., *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμά συγγράμματα*, dir. Panagiotēs K. Chrestou, IV (Thessaloniki: Kyromanos, 1988), 151, 23–153, II. Palamas argues for the triunity of God elsewhere, too: see Demetracopoulos, *Αὐγουστίνος*, 157–58, n. 230.

553 See Demetracopoulos, “Palamas Transformed,” 330–32; 335–36.

554 See Demetracopoulos, *art. cit.*, 393–401.

555 Manuel II Palaiologos, *Epistula ad dominum Alexium Iagoup*; in Charalambos J. Dendrinos, ed., “An Annotated Critical Edition (Editio Princeps) of Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus' Treatise *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*,” Doct. Diss., Royal Holloway, University of London, 1996 (forthcoming as CCSG 71), 338, 4–339, II.

556 *Id.*, op. cit., in Dendrinos, op. cit., 338, 7.

that these privileged, selected persons (prophets, Apostles, et sim.) are ranked high as far as their knowledge of God is concerned. As a matter of fact, even the select have finite theological knowledge; if compared to the divine infinity, this knowledge is next to nothing. In speaking thus, Manuel obviously reproduces some lines of the passage from Gregory Nazianzen's *Oration xxviii* 17 that echoes Xenophanes's B34 (see above, 337) (τῇ [...] τοῦ πλησίον δυνάμει παραμετρούμενον).

Manuel contrasts our faint knowledge with the direct and clear vision of the thing to be known (ὁρᾶν ἀμέσως καὶ καθαρῶς; γινῶναι ἀκριβῶς),⁵⁵⁷ which man is by nature incapable of achieving. This contrast obviously reflects the opening words of the above passage from Gregory Nazianzen's *Oration xxviii*, which, as seen (338–342), most probably echoes B34.

Manuel also silently yet clearly reproduces Gregory Nazianzen's celebrated *Oration xxviii*, 4 (see *supra*, 343), which contains, in its Hermetic version, the famous Platonic *Timaeus* 28C3–5. Here is Manuel's adaptation of Gregory's passage:

Εἰ [...] ἐνὴν μὲν ἀνθρώπειον νοῦν ἐξαρκεῖν τοῖς θειοτέροις ἀνδράσιν, ὥστε δύνασθαι γινῶναι τὸν ὑπὲρ γινῶσιν Θεὸν ἀκριβῶς, ἐνὴν δὲ γλωτταν αὐτοῖς ἐξυπηρετεῖν, ὥστε πρὸς ἄλλους φράζειν τὸν ἀφραστόν τε καὶ ἀκατάληπτον πᾶσι Θεόν...

If [...] it were possible for the human mind to be adequate for the holier men to enable them to know precisely God, Who is beyond knowledge, and if, moreover, it were possible that speech should serve them perfectly, in order to speak about God – Who is ineffable and incomprehensible for all – to others...⁵⁵⁸

Manuel, following Gregory closely, distinguishes between God as the allegedly knowable object (mind as the knower or the tool of knowledge used by man) and human speech as the means of sharing one's presumably achieved knowledge of God with one's fellow-humans who would like to obtain this knowledge. What he argues for is absolute apophaticism: the object we aspire to know exceeds both our mental and linguistic capacities, so we should abandon any hope of forming a clear concept of God.

A typical representative of patristic fideism, Manuel alerts anybody who would over-confidently like to get rid of the guidance of the Church and follow a personal, independent way of reaching truth in this life:

557 Id., op. cit., in Dendrinis, op. cit., 338, 15–339, 1; 339, 6.

558 Id., op. cit., in Dendrinis, op. cit., 339, 4–7.

᾽Οντως δέους εἶναι προσήκει μεστὸν καὶ μήτε ὕπνῳ χρῆσθαι μήτε σιτίοις, ὥς εἰώθει, μήτ' ἄλλω μηδενὶ τῶν ἀπάντων τὸν τὴν μυριοφόρον μὲν ἀφέμενον ὀλκάδα,⁵⁵⁹ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν φημί . . ., ἥς ὁ Κύριος καὶ τεχνίτης καὶ ναύκληρος, ὥς “διὰ σχεδίας” δὲ τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἑαυτοῦ δόξης καὶ ὑπολήψεως τὸ πέλαγος τοῦτο, “τὸν” ἡμέτερον “βίον”, ἐθέλοντα χειμῶνος διαπεράν.

Any man who abandons the ship that can bring a countless number of people . . . (I mean the Church . . ., whose builder and captain is the Lord) and wishes in a storm to cross the sea (that is, our life) on the raft of his own beliefs and notions about God, should be really full of fear, without sleep, food or anything else of the ordinary things of our life.⁵⁶⁰

This ship – raft contrast is an unacknowledged yet clear and partly identical reproduction of the famous Platonic image in *Phaedo* 85C1–D4 (Plato / Manuel: περὶ τῶν τοιούτων [sc. the divine things] / περὶ τὸ θεῖον; διὰ σχεδίας / διὰ σχεδίας; βεβαιωτέρου ὀχήματος / μυριοφόρον ὀλκάδα; ἐν τῷ νῦν βίῳ and τὸν βίον / τὸν ἡμέτερον βίον; κινδυνεύοντα / χειμῶνος; ὀχούμενον, διαπλευσαι; and διαπορευθῆναι / τὸ πέλαγος τοῦτο διαπεράν).⁵⁶¹ As has been seen (see *supra*, 263), the Platonic passage contains an implicit positive reference to B34, although it does not concede too much to the epistemological caution that colours Xenophanes's lines. Manuel deliberately omits Plato's strong exhortation that one must take great pains to discover the truth, whether by seeking conclusive proofs or by embarking upon the human doctrine (as upon a vessel) that is hardest to disprove. Instead, Manuel declares that the only way to cope successfully with the problem of truth is the method that Plato presents at the end of the passage as a merely theoretical scenario (cf. *supra*, 263; 265): follow divine revelation, which, contrary to a personal raft, secures for us the safety of the big ship. In contrast to Plato, Manuel accepts divine revelation both as in

559 This rare phrase occurs in Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae super "Psalms"* (PG 29, 213D) and *Homiliae in Hexaemeron* VI, 9 (Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta and Stig Y. Rudberg, *Basilii von Caesarea. Homilien zum Hexaemeron* [Berlin: Akademie, 1997], 105, 20); in Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra fatum* (James McDonough, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, III, 2 [Leiden: Brill, 1986], 51, 7), and *Oratio funebris in Meletium episcopum* (Andreas Spira, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, IX, 1 [Leiden: Brill, 1967], 444, 2); and in John Chrysostom, *In Psalmum 145* (PG 55, 519), and *De sancta Pelagia* (PG 50, 581). In none of them, however, does it have the meaning of the Christian Church.

560 Id., op. cit. 28, in Dendrinis, op. cit., 360, 11–15; tr. Dendrinis (slightly altered).

561 A comparison with Basil of Caesarea's assimilation of this Platonic passage (see *supra*, 315, n. 236) shows that Manuel paraphrased Plato in his own way, without having recourse to Basil.

principle possible, and as having actually taken place in the person of Jesus Christ; he thus implicitly subscribes to a strongly Sceptical version of B34, which he uses to pave the way for faith. Indeed, to Manuel, abandoning the big ship and trusting one's own skills and powers amounts to entering an extremely risky epistemic situation.

Further, Manuel's passage is an implicit yet clear refutation of the moderate theological optimism of Demetrios Cydones's, which, as seen (401), was expressed in terms of the same Platonic passage. This is indicated by the fact that Manuel reproduces the Platonic image by means of some of Cydones's words (τὸ πέλαιος τοῦτο; διαπερᾶν), which do not occur in the Platonic text, and denies exactly what Cydones deems attainable and, in the last resort, not so risky, namely, the individual quest for religious truth.

4.3 The Incompatibility of Manuel's Two Approaches to Scepticism

Manuel's views of the cognoscibility of God when he is in discussion with a non-Christian and when he is debating with the arrogant and philosophy-confident 'Latins' differ so much that they can hardly be accommodated. It seems that Manuel, for all his commitment to arguing for his religion and for the official theological teachings of his Church, had no established theological or philosophical criterion by means of which to judge what can or cannot be known. He simply satisfied his Christian self by taking a middling position, which can be described as follows: On one hand, insofar as he was interested in holding firm religious beliefs, he spoke of the human mind as basically capable of discerning among the extant religions the true one, i.e., Christianity. On the other hand, inasmuch as he was concerned about settling doctrinal discrepancies within the bosom of Christianity itself, he warned against freely and over-confidently using one's mind to figure out the 'correct' content of the true religion⁵⁶² (and it was out of this concern that he fully shared Christian theology's fourth-century flirtation with heathen Scepticism). In this divided situation, Manuel did not hesitate both to reproduce and to repudiate Xenophanes's B34: he consciously put it in Muterizes's impious mouth, on the one hand; and he subscribed to it through his unacknowledged reproduction of Gregory Nazianzen's *Oration xxviii*, 17 on the other. What makes Manuel's self-contradiction flagrant is his declaration that even an adherent to another, non-Christian doctrine or religion would normally agree with him that the discourse about God is a very slippery task.⁵⁶³

⁵⁶² Id., op. cit., in Dendrinis, op. cit., 347, 11–12; 349, 6; 349, 16; 350, 2–4; 353, 1; 366, 10.

⁵⁶³ Id., op. cit., in Dendrinis, op. cit., 358, 13–359, 1.

5 *George Gemistos – Plethon and George Scholarios – Gennadios II on the Scope and Limits of Reasoning*

5.1 Scholarios's Use of B34: Justifying the Existence of the 'Credibilia'
 The last Byzantine discussion of B34 formed part of the well-known intellectual quarrel between George Gemistos or Plethon (ca. 1360–1452 or 1454) and George Scholarios – Gennadios II (ca. 1400–paulo post 1472). As has been shown elsewhere,⁵⁶⁴ Scholarios in effect shared Aquinas's views on the degree and means of human knowledge of the divine in this life and in the life to come. Briefly speaking, in this life, natural theology is a possible and useful project, which results in what Aquinas called *demonstrabilia*. In addition, man shares in some fundamental truths revealed by God; these truths do not clash with reason (for, in fact, no truth can clash with reason), but cannot be attained by means of reason. Aquinas calls them *credibilia*. In his description of the limits of human reason or the *lumen naturale* Scholarios implicitly yet clearly reproduces B34. Contrasting the limited efficacy of demonstrations constructed by our *ratio discursiva* (ἡ ἀκολουθία τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν λόγου) to the absolute character of revealed truths (ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσίς), he says:⁵⁶⁵

Περὶ γὰρ τῶν θείων [8] καὶ “*ὑψηλῶν*”⁵⁶⁶ ... οὐδὲν ἔστιν εἰδέναι [5;7] *σαφές* [1],⁵⁶⁷ ἀλλ’ [cf. Xenophanes’s δ’] ἢ μόνον *μαντεύεσθαι* [cf. Xenophanes’s δόκος].

564 Demetracopoulos, *Πλήθων*, 81–89; id., “Georgios Gemistos – Plethon's Dependence on Thomas Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa Theologiae*,” *Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur* 12 (2006): 276–341, at 312–20.

565 George Scholarios – Gennadios II, *Κατὰ τῶν Πλήθωνος ἀποριῶν ἐπ’ Ἀριστοτέλει, Γενναδίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἅπαντα τὰ εὐρισκόμενα*. *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, ed. Louis Petit, Xénophon A. Sideridès, Martin Jugie, IV (Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1935), 21, 3–5. In 17, 14–22, Scholarios announces a special treatment of the reason-revelation problem, a treatment that he apparently never carried out. From what he says on 17, 20–22, one can guess that this treatment would form part of a refutation of Plethon's *Laws*, which, for all his knowledge of the content of the *Laws* (whether that knowledge was partial or full, direct or indirect), Scholarios was to announce only later on (see John A. Demetracopoulos, “Georgios Gennadios II – Scholarios' *Florilegium Thomisticum* II [De fato] and its anti-Plethonic Tenor,” *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 74, 2 [2007]: 301–76, at 335–43).

566 See also George Scholarios – Gennadios II, op. cit., 17, 15–16 and 21, 19–23: “τὴν περὶ τῶν θείων ἀλήθειαν”; “τὴν ὑψηλοτάτην καὶ θείαν ἀλήθειαν... ... Τινὰ ἀλήθειαν περὶ πάντων”. These words most probably derive from Thomas Aquinas's *Summa theologiae*, I^a, q. 1, a. 1, arg. 1, co. and ad 1^{um} (where Sap. Sol. 3:22: “χαλεπώτερά σου μὴ ζήτει”, is quoted) in Demetrios Cydones's translation (“τὰ ὑψηλότερά σου μὴ ζήτει”; see Thomas's passage in Demetracopoulos, *Πλήθων*, 83–84; 192–94).

567 I prefer “*σαφές*” to the “*σαφῶς*” given in the edition; in the apparatus criticus we are told that “*σαφές*” occurs in a MS which contains the work as revised by its author.

As far as the divine and high things are concerned, it is impossible for man to achieve clear knowledge; one can only make guesswork.

Knowledge of the most important things (ἡ τῶν μεγίστων εἰδησις) derives only from the principles of theology (ιερά διδασκαλία, what Aquinas calls *sacra doctrina*). Since Scholarios was contending with Plethon, it suited his argument to note that Plato, too, in several of his dialogues, held that man, in this life (where he lives unnaturally, i.e., as a being by nature simple and intelligible that exists in a state of admixture with a body in a corporeal world) is in real trouble when trying to find out the ultimate truth.⁵⁶⁸ Scholarios was probably hinting (though not exclusively) at the reception or echo of B34 in Plato's *Phaedo*, *Meno*, and *Cratylus* (see *supra*, 262–264; 270–271). This claim will now be clarified through examination of Plethon's sophisticated treatment of B34 and its Platonic reception.

5.2 Plethon: Xenophanes as the Epitome of Scepticism and its Overcoming

Plethon, in Ch. 3 of Book I of his *Laws*, quoted Xenophanes B34 (without naming Xenophanes or even indicating a quotation) alongside some typically Christian expressions of the human inability to scrutinize divine things⁵⁶⁹ in order to reject this conviction both as inappropriate on the part of the divine and as an injury to the dignity of human nature:

Οὐ μὲν δὴ οὐδ' ἐκείνο ὑπολογιστέον, ὃ αὖ φασί τινες, ὡς, κἄν περὶ οὐτουοῦν τῶν ἄλλων ἡμῖν ἢ τις ἀληθείας {1} κατάληψις {5; 7}, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὡς περὶ τῶν θείων [8] ἀνθρώποις {4} οἷσι προσήκει διασκοπεῖν πραγμάτων, ὡς οὐτ' [2; 6; 7] ἂν εἰσομένοις [5; 7] σαφές [1] οὐδὲν περὶ {8} [10] αὐτῶν, ἅτε δὴ κρειττόνων ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς...

Further, we should not pay attention to what some others say, namely that, even if it is conceded that we can get some hold of truth in regard to some of the other things, it is nevertheless inappropriate for us, who are mere human beings, to speculate about the divine things, because

568 George Scholarios – Gennadios II, *Κατὰ τῶν Πλήθωνος ἀποριῶν ἐπ' Ἀριστοτέλει*, in Petit, op. cit., 21, 15; 21, 25–28.

569 Cf. Plethon, *Laws* I, 2: “τὴν τῶν μεγίστων γνῶσιν τε καὶ κτῆσιν” (ed. Charles Alexandre, *Πλήθωνος Νόμων συγγραφῆς τὰ σωζόμενα. Pléthon. Traité des Lois*, tr. Augustin Pellissier [Paris: Firmin Didot, 1858; 1st reimpr., Amsterdam 1966; 2nd partial reimpr.: *Une cité idéale au xve siècle: L'utopie néo-païenne d'un Byzantin. Pléthon. Traité des Lois* [Paris: Vrin, 1982], 28, 25–30, 6).

“we are” supposedly “incapable of knowing anything certain about” them, the reason for that being that they transcend us...⁵⁷⁰

To assess the importance of this quotation, we must place it in the context of Plethon's unfolding argument in the introductory chapters of his *Laws*, i.e., Book I, chapters 1–4. Plethon begins by announcing his subject, ‘the best political institution’ (πολιτεία ἡ ἀρίστη). He intends to describe the state that is ruled by ‘the best laws’ and thereby can best serve the innate human aspiration for ‘living happily’ (εὐδαιμόνως βιοῦν). That, after all, is our ultimate end, the goal for whose sake men pursue and practise whatever we see them do in their lives:

“Τάδε συγγέγραπται” “περὶ νόμων τε καὶ πολιτείας” “τῆς ἀρίστης”, ἥ ἂν διανοούμενοι ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἅττ’ ἂν καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ κοινῇ μετιόντες τε καὶ ἐπιτηδεύοντες, ὡς δυνατὸν ἀνθρώπῳ,⁵⁷¹ “κάλλιστά τε καὶ ἄριστα βιῶεν” καὶ ἐς ὅσον οἶόν τε ‘εὐδαιμονέστατα’. Πεφύκασι γὰρ ‘ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι’ ‘τοῦτου’ αὐτοῦ ὅ τι μάλιστά τε καὶ κυριώτατα ἐφίεσθαι, τοῦ ὡς ‘εὐδαιμόνως βιοῦν’· καὶ τοῦτο “ἔν” τε καὶ “κοινὸν ἐπιθύμημα” ὑπάρχει ‘πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις’ ‘τέλος’ τε ἐκάστω τοῦ βίου, οὗ δὴ ἕνεκα καὶ “τᾶλλα” πάντα μετίασί τε καὶ πραγματεύονται.

“This is what has been written” “concerning the laws and the best political institution,” by which men's minds should be guided; and by following and practising which, both privately and publicly, men “may live the best and most excellent lives” open to them, and also ‘the happiest of lives’ to the greatest possible degree. For it is of the nature of ‘all men’ to aim chiefly and pre-eminently ‘at this’ – to “live in happiness.” This is ‘the one’ ‘universal desire’ in ‘all men,’ ‘the end’ of each man's life, the purpose for which they pursue and practise everything ‘else.’⁵⁷²

The origins of Plethon's wording run as follows. The opening words, Τάδε συγγέγραπται, reveal the way he viewed himself; according to Clement of

570 Plethon, *Laws* I, 3, in Alexandre, op. cit., 40, 4–8. See Demetracopoulos, *Πλάτων*, 100–104; id., “Georgios Gemistos – Plethon's,” 315–19. Cf. Plethon, op. cit., 40, 12–14.

571 Ex edit. ἀνθρώπων correxi.

572 Plethon, *Laws* I, 1, in Alexandre, op. cit., 16, 3–12. Herein, I use freely the translation of Christopher Montague Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 322–56.

Alexandria,⁵⁷³ Zoroaster opened a writing of his with the very same words: Αὐτὸς γοῦν ὁ Ζωροάστρις γράφει· ‘Τάδε συνέγραψα Ζωροάστρις...’ (“The following I wrote Zoroaster...”)⁵⁷⁴ (Zoroaster, fr. O 12).⁵⁷⁵ This fully accords with

573 Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* v, 14, 103, 3, in Otto Stählin, Ludwig Früchtel, Ursula Treu, ed., *Clemens Alexandrinus*, II, *Stromata Buch I–VI* (GCS 15; Berlin: Akademie, 1985), 395, 19–20. These lines belong to one of the long excerpts from Clement’s *Stromata* in Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Praeparatio Evangelica* (XIII, 13, 30, 3–4 in Édouard des Places, ed., *Eusèbe de Césarée. La Préparation évangélique. Livres XII–XIII* [SC 307; Paris: Cerf, 1983], 350).

574 As far as I am able to check, this is the only pre-Plethonic use of the verbal phrase ‘τάδε συγγράφειν’.

575 Joseph Bidez and Franz Cumont, ed., *Les mages hellénisés. Zoroastre, Ostanès et Hystaspe, d’après la tradition grecque*, II, *Les textes* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1938; repr. 1973), 158. Proclus, in his *Commentary on Plato’s “Republic,”* says that he had read Zoroaster’s work: it included four books, was entitled *Περὶ φύσεως* (*On Nature*), and its opening words run: “Ζωροάστρης ὁ Ἀρμενίου Πάμφυλος τάδε λέγει” etc. (Wilhelm Kroll, ed., *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Rem publicam commentarii*, II (Leipzig: Teubner, 1901; repr. Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1965), 109, 13–15 = fr. O 13, Bidez and Cumont, op. cit., 159–60; cf. Mark J. Edwards, “How Many Zoroasters?” *Vigiliae Christianae* 42 [1988]: 282–89, at 283). Since Plethon’s opening words coincide not with Proclus’, but with Clement’s report on the opening words of that alleged Zoroastrian writing (cf. Michael Stausberg, “A Name for All and No One: Zoroaster as a Figure of Authorization and a Screen of Ascription,” in *The Invention of the Sacred Tradition*, ed. James R. Lewis and Olav Hammer [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007], 177–97, at 188–89), we must infer that Plethon based himself on Clement (and/or Eusebius of Caesarea’s reproduction of Clement’s lines). This is a guess on Plethon’s change of ‘συνέγραψα’ to ‘συγγέγραπται’. It is Plethon himself who says that his writing expounds ‘the theology of Zoroaster and Plato.’ As we see, this is to be taken literally, in the sense that, from the very beginning, Plethon produces his writing by using each third or fourth word terms, phrases and sentences from these authors. Instead of anachronistically – i.e. on the basis of the modern literary standards – taking that as an implicit plagiarism, we should better explain it in terms of Plethon’s explicit belief in reincarnation and his personal belief that he was Plato and even Zoroaster reincarnated; for, who would start a book by means of the opening words of a writing by another author unless he believed he was the same person? Now, given that Plethon believed that he, a mixed soul-and body-composite being, was just a ring in a chain of a particular reincarnated soul, he preferred to change the singular in number and active in voice verb used by the most ancient known sage, i.e. Zoroaster, to the passive (impersonal) voice and perfect tense; ‘συγγέγραπται’ means “these doctrines have been written from many years ago (actually from all eternity, since truth is eternal and permeates all the ages of mankind (see *Laws* III, 43, in Alexandre 252, 8–16; cf. Brigitte Tambrun, *Pléthon: le retour de Platon* [Paris: Vrin, 2006], 105–106) and forever.” Cf. Plethon’s apparently presumptuous declaration (an imitation of Thucydides’s *Historiae* 1, 22, 4; see Demetracopoulos,

Plethon's declaration that his *Laws* "contains theology according to Zoroaster and Plato"⁵⁷⁶ and probably suggests that Plethon believed he was Zoroaster (and Plato) reincarnated.⁵⁷⁷

Further, the words Plethon uses to describe the subject of the writing, *περὶ νόμων τε καὶ πολιτείας*, derives verbatim from Plato's *Laws* 712A2. Plato uses several variants of this phrase very often in his *Laws*.⁵⁷⁸ As for the celebrated phrase *πολιτεία ἡ ἀρίστη*, it occurs very often in Aristotle's *Politics*.⁵⁷⁹ Besides, we should not overlook the fact that it is from this Aristotelian writing⁵⁸⁰ that Plethon borrows the idea that, to resolve the problem of the nature of the best state, one must first answer the question what sort of life is pertinent for man.⁵⁸¹ Still, we must also take into account that the phrase *πολιτεία ἡ ἀρίστη* occurs in Plato, too, once in *Republic* 497B7 (cf. 562A4: *πολιτεία ἡ καλλίστη*) and once in *Laws* 739A7, and that Plethon's *κάλλιστά τε καὶ ἄριστα βίῳ* is a latent yet direct quotation of Plato's *Laws* 817B3–4: *πάντα οὖν ἡμῖν ἡ πολιτεία συνέστηκε μίμησις τοῦ καλλίστου καὶ ἀρίστου βίου*. Even Plethon's *ἐς ὅσον οἶδ' ὅτι* (an adverb extremely rare in its superlative form) was borrowed from the same Platonic work.⁵⁸²

"Τὰ προβλήματα," 42) in *Laws* I, 4 that his writing was produced so as "to be a possession for ever before ('κτῆμα αἰεὶ προκεισομένην') those of the mankind who wish to pass their lives . . . established in the best and noblest fashion."

576 Plethon, *Laws*, Preface, in Alexandre, op. cit., 2, 3–4.

577 On Plethon's views of Zoroaster (identified by Clement of Alexandria with Er in Plato's *Republic* 614B) see Brigitte Tambrun-Krasker, *Μαγικά λόγια τῶν ἀπὸ Ζωροάστρου μάγων. Γεωργίου Γεμιστοῦ Πλήθωνος Ἐξήγησις εἰς τὰ αὐτὰ λόγια. Oracles chaldaïques. Recension de Georges Gémiste Pléthon. Edition critique avec introduction, traduction et commentaire. La recension arabe des Μαγικά λόγια, par M. Tardieu* (Athens: The Academy of Athens 1995), 37–47; ead., *Pléthon: le retour*, 59–66; 78–79; 81–85; 91–94; 105–106.

578 Plato, *Laws* 625A6; 641D9; 678A3; 685A3; 686C1; 708C4; 709A4; 715B3; 739B8; 822E5; 960E10–11. See also Plato's *Epistle* VII, 328C1.

579 Aristotle, *Politics* 1260b24–25; 1262b39; 1265b34–35; 1266a2; 1276b37; 1284b25; 1286a15; 1288b22 and 31; 1289a31; 1289b15; 1290a27; 1293b19; 1295a25; 1296b2; 1316a3. See also Aristotle's *Ethica Nicomachea* 1181b21.

580 Aristotle, *Politics* VII, 1, 1, 1323a14–21.

581 See also Plethon, *Laws* III, 43, in Alexandre, op. cit., 256, 17–25.

582 Plato, *Laws* 662E4; 710B7. Cf. 742D8; 743C6. In general, Plethon writes as if he was re-writing Plato's *Laws* in a different age, namely, as if being Plato reincarnated in Late Byzantium. On Plethon's taking liberties with Plato's works see Fabio Pagani, "*Damnata verba*: censure di Pletone in alcuni codici platonici," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 102, 1 (2009): 167–202; id., "Un nuovo testimone della *recensio* pletoniana al testo di Platone: il Marc. Gr. 188 (K)," *Res publica litterarum* 29 (2006): 5–20.

From Plato's *Laws*, Plethon reproduces 687C1: πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ κοινὸν ἐπιθύμημα ἓν τι . . . Plethon's dependence, although obvious, has no philosophical import, for the subject that Plato fits to this predicate is everybody's natural desire to see desires realised (687C5–6). Plethon also puts this subject in well-known Aristotelian terms by distinguishing between 'particular ends' (or just 'means') and the 'ultimate end' (τέλος τοῦ βίου; οὐ ἕνεκα). Here Plethon seems to paraphrase Aristotle's celebrated passage from the opening chapter of Book I of the *Nicomachean Ethics*:

Πᾶσα τέχνη καὶ πᾶσα μέθοδος, ὁμοίως δὲ πράξις τε καὶ προαίρεσις, ἀγαθοῦ τίνος ἐφίεσθαι δοκεῖ· διὸ καλῶς ἀπεφήναντο τάγαθόν, 'οὐ πάντ' ἐφίεται'. [...] Εἰ δὴ τι τέλος ἐστὶ τῶν πρακτῶν ὃ δι' αὐτὸ βουλόμεθα, τᾶλλα δὲ διὰ τοῦτο, καὶ μὴ πάντα δι' ἕτερον αἰρούμεθα . . ., δῆλον ὡς τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη τάγαθόν καὶ τὸ ἄριστον. [...] Λέγωμεν [...] τί τὸ πάντων ἀκρότατον τῶν πρακτῶν ἀγαθόν. Ὅνόματι μὲν οὖν σχεδὸν ὑπὸ τῶν πλείστων ὁμολογεῖται· τὴν γὰρ εὐδαιμονίαν καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ οἱ χαρίεντες λέγουσιν, τὸ δ' 'εὖ ζῆν' καὶ τὸ 'εὖ πράττειν' ταῦτόν ὑπολαμβάνουσι τῷ 'εὐδαιμονεῖν'.⁵⁸³

Every art and every investigation, and likewise every practical pursuit or undertaking, seems to aim at some good: hence it has been well said that the good is "that at which all things aim." [...] If therefore among the ends at which our actions aim there be one that we wish for its own sake, while we wish the others only for the sake of this, and if we do not choose everything for the sake of something else . . ., it is clear that this one ultimate end must be the good, and indeed the supreme good. [...] Let us discuss [...] what is the highest of all the goods that action can achieve. As far as the name goes, we may almost say that the great majority of mankind are agreed about this; for both the multitude and persons of refinement speak of it as happiness, and conceive 'the good life' or 'doing well' to be same thing as 'being happy.'⁵⁸⁴

583 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1094a1–3; 18–22; 1095a14–20. See also op. cit. 1097a28–b21; *Eudemian Ethics* 1219a10–11.

584 Tr. Harris Rackham, *Aristotle in Twenty-Three Volumes*, xix, *The Nicomachean Ethics* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1926; 21934), 3.

What about the crucial phrase εὐδαιμόνως βιοῦν? Whereas εὐδαιμόνως ζῆν is rather common,⁵⁸⁵ the phrase εὐδαιμόνως βιοῦν is rare; one of its very few occurrences is Sextus Empiricus's *Adversus Mathematicos* XI, 110,⁵⁸⁶ a passage that discusses whether one can achieve happiness or not (νυνὶ δὲ ζητῶμεν, εἰ [...] δυνατόν ἐστιν εὐρώως ἅμα καὶ εὐδαιμόνως βιοῦν) in order to show that it is not possible to achieve happiness by means of holding any Dogmatic beliefs on good and bad things (XI, 118: οὐκ ἄρα ἔνεστιν εὐδαιμόνως βιοῦν ἀγαθὰ τινα ἢ κακὰ ὑποστησάμενον).⁵⁸⁷ This argument in Sextus is not coincidental to Plethon's interests, for immediately afterwards, Plethon offers a panorama of the various views of happiness,⁵⁸⁸ which he deems necessary to offer and scrutinize, if a solid doctrine of happiness is to be constructed.⁵⁸⁹

This is why Plethon, although he paraphrases the above-quoted Aristotelian text, does not use Aristotle's εὖ ζῆν or εὖ πράττειν, but Sextus's phrase εὐδαιμόνως βιοῦν. True, what Plethon says immediately thereafter, i.e., that there are significantly variant ways to pursue happiness ("Ἰενται μέντοι εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τοῦτο ἐπιθύμημα οὐκέθ' ὁμοίως ἕκαστοι διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἥδη διιστάμενοι)⁵⁹⁰ is exactly what Aristotle, too, says immediately afterwards (Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας, τί ἐστιν, ἀμφισβητοῦσι καὶ οὐχ ὁμοίως οἱ πολλοὶ τοῖς σοφοῖς ἀποδιδῶσι; 1095a20–22).⁵⁹¹

585 See e.g., Aristotle, *Eudemean Ethics* 1214b5; *Politics* 1281a2; 1323b1; *Protrepticus*, fr. 41, 5; 55, 41 (ed. Valentin Rose, *Aristotelis fragmenta* [Lipsiae: Teubner, 1886]).

586 The other occurrences are in Aristotle's *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* 1421a13 and Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias's *De anima libri mantissa* (ed. Ivo Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora* [CAG, Suppl. 11, 1; Berlin: Reimer, 1887], 159, 16–17; 163, 17–18).

587 Mutschmann, *Sexti*, 11, 399 (see also op. cit. VII, 11, in Mutschmann, 4). Sextus seems to reproduce Chrysippus's definition of 'happy life' as "the life in conformity with virtue" ("ἐν τῷ κατ' ἀρετὴν βιοῦν μόνον ἐστὶ τὸ εὐδαιμόνως"; Chrysippus, fr. 111, 139; ab Arnim, *Stoicorum*, 111, 34, 10–11; *apud* Plutarch, *De communibus notionibus* 1060D8–9). Likewise, 'εὐρώως βιοῦν' or 'εὐροια βίου' is a typically Stoic expression (see Iohannes ab Arnim and Maximilian Adler, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, IV [Lipsiae: Teubner, 1924], 60, s.v. εὐροια). It is not unreasonable to say that Plethon was aware of the Stoic affinity of the doctrine laid down and refuted by Sextus, for in the prefatory note that precedes the *Laws* (a note most probably written by Plethon himself and preserved by Demetrios Raoul Kavakes; Alexandre, op. cit., 2, 10–11), we are told that "this work comprises... Ethics according to the same philosophers [sc. Zoroaster and Plato] and also according to the Stoics as well".

588 Plethon, *Laws* 1, 1, in Alexandre, op. cit., 16, 12–20, 21.

589 Op. cit., 16, 3–12.

590 Op. cit., 16, 12–14.

591 Still, Plethon's wording must have been borrowed from Maximus of Tyre: "... πάντες ἔρωτος κοινωνοῦντες ἑνός, τοῦ πρὸς τοῦ ἀγαθόν, ἵενται [Plethon *verbatim*] πολλάς καὶ παντοδαπὰς

Even Plethon's list of the fundamental means of pursuing of happiness, i.e., pleasure, money, glory, and virtue, coincides with Aristotle's development of this topic immediately afterwards (1095a22–29). Nonetheless, Plethon's focus is different. First, in his list of the fundamental means of pursuing happiness, he emphatically repeats βιοῦν (in the composite form of διαβιοῦν) and its cognate βίος.⁵⁹² It is not improbable that he intended thus to differentiate himself from Aristotle's 'biological' approach to happiness; indeed, as even some lexicographers had remarked, ζῆν is applied both to man and the other animals, whereas βιοῦν applies only to man.⁵⁹³ Apparently, from the body of Aristotle's ethical doctrine, Plethon was not prepared to subscribe to anything more than its introductory truisms that everybody aspires to happiness and that each strives to acquire it in his own way. Further, Plethon implicitly subscribes to a flagrantly Stoic version of the doctrine that "only and solely virtue" provides men with happiness: . . . ὡς μόνην ἄν ἀρετὴν τῷ ὄντι εὐδαίμονας τε καὶ μακαρίους τοὺς ἐπιτηδεύοντας παρεχόμενην.⁵⁹⁴ To Plethon, moreover, Aristotle's ethics was 'hedonistic' or base.⁵⁹⁵ Furthermore, as Plethon unfolded his argument in the *Laws*, the time had not yet come to enter into a discussion of morality and virtues; these matters would be discussed as late as Book III, Chs. 3–13.⁵⁹⁶ The reason why Plethon referred to morality in I.1 was that politics – his central theme – falls under ethics. After enunciating this truism, he points out what

ὁδούς [cf. Plethon's "διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν"], ἄλλος ἄλλης πράξεως νενεμημένος καὶ μοῖραν καὶ τύχην" (cf. *supra*, 299).

592 Op. cit., 16, 14–18, 8. Plethon keeps using this lexeme throughout Ch. 1, till the very last paragraph; see *ibid.*, 26, 16–17: "... ὅπως βιώῃ ἄν τὸν αὐτοῦ εἴσεται βίον . . . εὐδαίμονος . . .". See also Plethon's *On Virtues* 11, in Brigitte Tambrun-Krasker, *Γεωργίου Γεμιστοῦ Πλήθωνος Περὶ ἀρετῶν. Georges Gémiste Pléthon. Traité des vertus* (Athens: Academy of Athens, 1987), 12, 15–18, where βιοῦν is applied to man and the natures superior to him, in an implicit contrast to the life of the beasts.

593 See, e.g., Ammonius Grammaticus (probably 1st/2nd cent. AD), *De adfinium vocabulorum differentia* 100; 101, in Klaus Nickau, *Ammonii qui dicitur liber de adfinium vocabulorum differentia* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1966), 25, 6–14. To Ammonius, it was Aristotle who connected 'βιοῦν' with humans. Still, the fact remains that, in his writings, Aristotle normally uses 'ζῆν'.

594 Plethon, *Laws* I, 1, in Alexandre, op. cit., 18, 7–8.

595 Plethon, *Περὶ ὧν Ἀριστοτέλης πρὸς Πλάτωνα διαφέρεται* 5, in Bernadette Lagarde, ed., "Le *De differentiis* de Pléthon d'après l'autographe de la Marcienne," *Byzantion* 43 (1973): 312–43, at 329, 9–40; Plethon, *Πρὸς τὰς Σχολαρίου ὑπὲρ Ἀριστοτέλους ἀντιλήψεις* v, 2, in Bernadette Lagarde, ed., "Georges Gémiste Pléthon: *Contre les objections de Scholarios en faveur d'Aristote (Réplique)*," *Byzantion* 59 (1989): 354–507, at 461–66.

596 See Plethon, *Laws*, List of Contents, in Alexandre, op. cit., 12, 5–17.

the very title (Περὶ διαφορᾶς τῶν περὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἀνθρώποις δοξῶν) of Chapter 1 says, namely that opinions on matters of supreme importance vary significantly amongst men. So, having categorized the above-mentioned four groups of men according to the means of happiness each selects, he goes on by subdividing Class 4 ('virtue') as follows:⁵⁹⁷

- 4.1. Does virtue amount to knowledge or ignorance?
- 4.2. Does virtue amount to making religious sacrifices or not?
 - 4.2.1. If so, what kind of sacrifice does virtue amount to?
- 4.3. Does virtue amount to chastity and solitary life or marriage with sexual intercourse and offspring?⁵⁹⁸
- 4.4. Does virtue amount to abstaining from certain kinds of food (fasting) or eating all kinds in proper measure?
- 4.5. Is virtue closely related to one's dirtiness or is cleanliness a good thing?
- 4.6. Does virtue consist in poverty or is money to some extent a good thing?
- 4.7. Does virtue consist in lack of *pudor* (the Cynical virtue of *anaideia*) or in decency?
- 4.8. Is virtue to be pursued for its own sake, i.e., for the happiness it grants on its own merit, or is it unpleasant per se and yet must be pursued for the sake of some kind of divine reward?

Now, it is of great importance to note that both the opening and the concluding words of this eight-fold unit derive from Sextus Empiricus. Plethon introduces the eight-fold division of virtue-based ethics as follows:

Καὶ μὴν δὴ οὐδ' ἀρετῆς αὐτῆς οἱ αὐτοὶ ἅπανι νόμοι· οὐ γὰρ τὰ αὐτὰ πᾶσι καλὰ τε καὶ αἰσχροῦ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν οὐδ' ὁμοίως νομιζόμενα.⁵⁹⁹

This is simply a direct reproduction of Sextus's *Pyrrhonian Outlines* III, 222 and 226:⁶⁰⁰

597 Op. cit., 18, 9–20, 21.

598 Plethon's rare word 'μοναυλία' (contrasted with 'γάμοι'), derives from Plato's *Laws* 721D2–3, where it is also contrasted with 'γαμεῖν.' 'Μοναυλία' occurs (though rarely) in Christian literature, too, meaning the monastic way of life.

599 Op. cit., 18, 9–11.

600 Mau, *Sexti*, I, 193 and 194.

Εἰ μέντοι τι ἦν ὅσιον φύσει θῦμα καὶ ἀνόσιον, παρὰ πᾶσιν ἂν ὁμοίως ἐνομιζέτο...
Καίτοι εἴ γε ἦν φύσει τὰ τῆς θρησκείας καὶ τῶν ἀθέσμων, παρὰ πᾶσιν ἂν ὁμοίως
ἐνομιζέτο.

Plethon used these Sextan lines again in his exposition of case 4.2.1:

... Οἱ δὲ τὰ μὲν τῶν τοιούτων [sc. θυμάτων] ὅσια, τὰ δ' ἀνόσια ἡγῆνται, ἄλλοι τε
ἄλλα, καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ οἱ μὲν ὅσια, οἱ δ' ἀνόσια νομίζοντες.⁶⁰¹

In a similar manner, Plethon concluded his survey of the eight-fold views of the content of virtue by describing all this mess with a paraphrase of Sextus Empiricus's *Pyrrhonian Outlines* I, 112: Τοσαύτης οὖν καὶ ἔτι πλείονος ἀνωμαλίας τε οὔσης καὶ ταραχῆς κατὰ τὸν βίον τὸν ἀνθρώπινον...⁶⁰² As one might have expected from the very title of the chapter, Plethon was prepared to recognize fully the chaos of human beliefs about the best life (ὁ ἄριστος βίος), a chaos that the Sceptics traditionally placed in the service of their argument against Dogmatics. Nonetheless, Plethon explicitly, carefully, and successfully undertakes to discern which one, of the eight, truly results in human happiness.⁶⁰³ We must conclude that Plethon had taken the Sceptical challenge seriously.⁶⁰⁴

That he did so is indicated by another of his unacknowledged sources, one detected by Brigitte Tambrun-Krasker.⁶⁰⁵ Plethon's list of the fundamental means of the pursuit of happiness may have coincided with Aristotle's list, but it was further enriched by Lucian's (2nd cent. AD) piquant description of the

601 Plethon, *Laws* I, 1, in Alexandre, op. cit., 18, 18–23. See also III, 43, in Alexandre, op. cit., 256, 9–10: "... ἄλλοις δ' ἄλλων γιγνομένων καὶ διαφορῶν περὶ τοῦ θείου ἀνθρώποις τῶν δοξῶν...". Of course, Plethon counter-argues that, for all this divergence, "μίαν μὲν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰετὴν κρατίστην εἶναι [sc. "ἡ κατὰ Ζωροάστρην" and "ἡ κατὰ τε Πυθαγόραν καὶ Πλάτωνα [...]] φιλοσοφία"; 256, 13–15], τὰς δ' ἄλλας φαυλοτέρας" (256, 10–11).

602 Op. cit., 20, 22–23. On this parallel see Demetracopoulos, *Πλήθων*, 85; id., "Georgios Gemistos – Plethon's Dependence," 313.

603 Op. cit., 20, 23–22, 4.

604 On Plethon's preoccupation with Scepticism see Brigitte Tambrun-Krasker, "Le prologue du *Traité des Lois* de Pléthon et le regain d'intérêt pour le scepticisme aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles" in *Entrer en matière: les prologues*, ed. Jean-Daniel Dubois and Bernard Roussel (Paris: Cerf 1997), 271–91, at 274–75 (where Sextus's writings are mentioned as possible sources of Plethon's way of exposition of the various moral ideas) and 290; cf. Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 232–33, n. 368.

605 Tambrun-Krasker, *Pléthon: le retour*, 60–62.

divergence between the various philosophical views of happiness.⁶⁰⁶ Lucian was, in a sense, a Sceptic. Indeed, Lucian's description of the *dissensio philosophorum* resembled that of Sextus Empiricus, who was the main source of Plethon's exhibition of the divergent views of ethics. Lucian has only bitter irony for the alleged 'wise men' who, for all their supposed wisdom, obstinately fought with each other and οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐδόξαζον⁶⁰⁷ ("did not hold the same positions on the same issues"), so that each was able only to 'reinforce' Lucian's sense of 'ignorance and impasse' (τὴν ἄγνοιαν καὶ τὴν ἀπορίαν πλείονα).⁶⁰⁸ This phrasing is very close to Sextus Empiricus's description of the typical intellectual biography of the Sceptics (see *supra*, 315, n. 236): professors prove unable to resolve questions, and their efforts to find resolutions result only in more questions.⁶⁰⁹

Plethon may have drawn his inspiration to use Lucian to depict Scepticism from Nicephoros Gregoras. Plethon shared Gregoras's extreme anti-Aristotelianism; for instance, he reproduced Gregoras's critique of Aristotle's logical doctrine of 'relatives.'⁶¹⁰ He did not share, however, Gregoras's Scepticism. Now, Gregoras had quoted Lucian's critique of the consistency of the funda-

606 Lucian, *Menippus* 4: "Ἀμέλει ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν παρήγει τὸ πᾶν ἥδεσθαι καὶ μόνον τοῦτο ἐκ παντὸς μετιέναι· τοῦτο γὰρ εἶναι τὸ εὐδαιμον. Ὁ δὲ τις ἔμπαλιν πονεῖν τὰ πάντα καὶ μοχθεῖν καὶ τὸ σῶμα καταναγκάζειν ῥυπῶντα καὶ αὐχμῶντα καὶ πᾶσι δυσαρεστοῦντα καὶ λοιδορούμενον..." Ἄλλος καταφρονεῖν χρημάτων παρεκελεύετο καὶ ἀδιάφορον οἶεσθαι τὴν κτῆσιν αὐτῶν· ὁ δὲ τις ἔμπαλιν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι καὶ τὸν πλοῦτον ἀπεφαίνετο" (ed. Macleod, *Luciani*, I, 264, 17–25). See also Plethon, *De rebus Peloponnesiacis oratio II*, 16: "οἱ μὲν ἂν [...] ἀρετὴν καὶ τὸ κάλλος παντὸς τοῦ βίου προστήσαιντο... Οἱ δ'... ἡδονὴν τὸ πᾶν δοῖεν τοῦ βίου... Οἷν μεταξὺ αὐ καὶ οἱ τε περὶ δόξαν ἐσπουδαχότες καὶ οἱ περὶ τὰ χρήματα..." (PG 160, 856C). On Lucian's stance towards philosophy, see the comprehensive remarks of Jean-Marie André, "Les écoles philosophiques aux deux premiers siècles de l'Empire," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II, 36, 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987), 5–77, at 65–69.

607 Lucian, *Icaromenippus* 5 (Macleod, op. cit., 293, 3–4).

608 Lucian, *Menippus* 4 (Macleod, op. cit., 264, 14–15).

609 See, e.g., Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* I, 74: "Οὐκ ἀνέειλε δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὰς ἀπορίας, ἀλλ' ἐπέτεινεν" (Mau, *Sexti*, III, 20).

610 Compare Plethon's *Περὶ ὧν Ἀριστοτέλης πρὸς Πλάτωνα διαφέρεται* 6 (in Lagarde, "Le De differentiis," 325, 34–326, 8) to Gregoras' *Florentius* 1534–57 (Leone, *Niceforo Gregora*. Fiorenzo, 120–21); see John A. Demetrapoulos, "Ο ἀντιπληθωνισμός τοῦ Γεωργίου Γενναδίου-Σχολαρίου ὡς ρίζα τοῦ φιλοθωμισμοῦ τοῦ καὶ ὁ ἀντιχριστιανισμός τοῦ Γεωργίου Πλήθωνος-Γεμιστοῦ ὡς ρίζα τοῦ ἀντιαριστοτελισμοῦ τοῦ" in *International Society for Plethonic and Byzantine Studies. Acts of the 1st Congress: "Byzantium and Europe"* (Mistras, May 26–28, 2000), ed. Linos G. Benakis (Athens: International Society of Plethonic and Byzantine Studies, 2001), 109–27, at 124–26.

mental geometrical concepts (in *Hermotimus* 74)⁶¹¹ in the context of his critical examination of the epistemic status of geometrically-based astronomical theories. What is important is that Lucian's argument occupies a prominent place in Sextus Empiricus's critique of the geometers.⁶¹²

Methodically enough, Plethon goes on to say⁶¹³ that, to resolve the problem of the pursuit of happiness, one must first resolve the problem of what human nature and potential is, for happiness is sought by man and for man. In turn, this resolution presupposes a solid answer to the question of the nature of all beings, since man forms part of the universe and hence cannot be defined without reference to it.⁶¹⁴ "On the nature of other beings," Plethon states frankly, "there are again many disagreements."

1. Do any gods exist or not?
 - 1.1. If so, are they involved in the affairs of the universe and in human affairs or not?
 - 1.1.1. If they are involved, are they involved as causes only of good things or as causes both of good and bad things?
 - 1.1.2. If they are involved in the human affairs, are they influenced by prayers or do they just cause the best possible thing to occur according to what their own judgment dictates?⁶¹⁵
 - 1.2. Is there only one god or more?
 - 1.2.1. If there are many, are they equal to each other or do they form a hierarchy with a unique god at its summit?
 - 2.1. With regard to the universe, was it created in time or from eternity?
 - 2.2. Further, will it last forever or is it to collapse, or partly one and partly the other?
 - 2.3. Furthermore, is the universe ungenerated in respect of cause or time?
 - 2.4. Can the universe be changed by its cause, i.e., God, or not?⁶¹⁶ The same disagreement holds with regard to the human nature (3); is

⁶¹¹ Macleod, *Luciani*, IV, 76, 22–28.

⁶¹² Demetracopoulos, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, 120.

⁶¹³ Alexandre, op. cit., 22, 4–12.

⁶¹⁴ Op. cit., 22, 12–25.

⁶¹⁵ Plethon also lists these questions in *De rebus Peloponnesiacis oratio* II 15–16 (PG 160, 853D–856B; cf. 853, n. 48).

⁶¹⁶ Plethon, *Laws* I, 1 (Alexandre, op. cit., 22, 26–24, 3).

man just an animal, like the others, or is he akin to God, or rather something in-between?⁶¹⁷

In the end, Plethon summarises the above disagreements by using words and phrases that occur in Sextus Empiricus and Plato (Ταῦτ' οὖν τοσαύτης ὄντα 'ταραχῆς' τε 'πλέα' καὶ 'ἀμφισβητήσεως'...).⁶¹⁸ As might be expected, his description of each of these disagreements can be traced back to Sextus. For instance, Plethon puts issue 1 like this:

... ἔστι μὲν ὦν οὐδ' εἶναι θεοὺς τὸ παράπαν οἰομένων, τῶν δ' εἶναι μὲν, τῶν δ' ἀνθρωπίνων οὐκ ἂν προνοεῖν πραγμάτων. τῶν δὲ προνοεῖν μὲν θεοὺς τῶν πάντων, τῶν τε ἄλλων καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων, εἶναί γε μὴν πρὸς τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τοὺς αὐτοὺς καὶ τῶν κακῶν αἰτίους. τῶν δὲ κακοῦ μὲν οὐδενός, τῶν δὲ ἀγαθῶν μόνων αἰτίους τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι.⁶¹⁹

If we overlook the peculiar Plethonic style of this passage, it appears to be a smart collage of Plato's *Laws* 948C2–3 and Sextus's *Pyrrhonian Outlines* III, 9–10:

Plato:

... Μέρος τι μὲν [...] ἀνθρώπων [...] τὸ παράπαν οὐχ ἡγούνται θεοὺς, οἱ δὲ οὐ φροντίζειν ἡμῶν αὐτοὺς διανοοῦνται...⁶²⁰

Sextus:

... Ὁ λέγων εἶναι θεὸν ἥτοι προνοεῖν αὐτὸν τῶν ἐν κόσμῳ φησὶν ἢ οὐ προνοεῖν. καὶ εἰ μὲν προνοεῖν, ἥτοι πάντων ἢ τινων. Ἄλλ' εἰ μὲν πάντων προουνόει, οὐκ

617 Plethon in Alexandre, op. cit., 24, 3–11. Cf. Plethon, *De rebus Peloponnesiacis oratio* II 16 (PG 160, 856C–D).

618 Plethon, *Laws* I, 1 (Alexandre, op. cit., 24, 12–13). For 'ταραχή' (i.e., 'confusion') see Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* III, 57 (Mau, *Sexti*, III, 119) and VIII, 130 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 182). On Plato's wording (*Gorgias* 451D9–452A1; *Leges* 861A9–10) see Demetracopoulos, *Πλάτων*, 86; id., "Georgios Gemistos – Plethon's Dependence," 314.

619 See also Plethon, *De rebus Peloponnesiacis oratio* II 16 (PG 160, 856B4–9).

620 See also Plato's *Laws* 885C7–8: "Ἡμῶν γάρ οἱ μὲν τὸ παράπαν θεοὺς οὐδαμῶς νομίζομεν, οἱ δὲ οἷους ὑμεῖς λέγετε". Cf. Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* IX, 50 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 224): "Τῶν περὶ ὑπάρξεως θεοῦ σκεψαμένων οἱ μὲν εἶναί φασι θεόν, οἱ δὲ μὴ εἶναι..."; IX, 191 (Mutschmann, *Sexti*, II, 254): "Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἀντεπιχειρούμενα παρὰ τοῖς δογματικοῖς φιλοσόφοις εἰς τὸ εἶναι θεοὺς καὶ εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι τοιαῦτά τινα καθέστηκεν. Ἐφ' οἷς ἡ τῶν σκεπτικῶν ἐποχὴ συνεισάγεται," which is exactly what Plethon tries to counter successfully in the introductory part of his work.

ἦν ἂν οὔτε κακόν τι οὔτε κακία ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ . . . οὐκ ἄρα πάντων προνοεῖν
 λεχθήσεται ὁ θεός. Εἰ δέ τινων προνοεῖ, διὰ τί τῶνδε μὲν προνοεῖ, τῶνδε δὲ οὔ;⁶²¹

Now, as has been explained elsewhere,⁶²² Plethon's subsequent declaration of his determination to scrutinize all views is an unacknowledged paraphrase of the Platonic Socrates's exhortation in *Phaedo* 85C1–D4 (see *supra*, 263–265) to keep persistently assessing the various philosophical doctrines about mankind until the goal is reached, i.e., until one declares some view to be trustworthy.⁶²³ Indeed, in the concluding lines of the first and the opening lines of the second chapter of the *Laws*,⁶²⁴ Plethon picks up two quite possible ways of effectively approaching truth, i.e., attaining truth by means of one's own reasoning, and getting as close as possible to it by adhering to any idea that cannot be disproved. Here Plethon ostentatiously and tellingly omits Plato's introductory alert that, as Xenophanes had said, clear truth cannot be reached in this life; he reproduces only the positive, optimistic part of the Platonic passage. This perfectly matches Plethon's refutation of B34, which, as I have tried to show elsewhere,⁶²⁵ stands as a submerged refutation of the traditional Christian alliance with Scepticism, including the positive Christian reception of B34 examined in this study.

Let me only add here a comment on a relevant passage from Plethon's *Laws* 1, 2. Plethon ascribes to the Couretes (he thought of himself as one of them) the important task of fighting in the intellectual arena in defense of the pagan truths, especially polytheism, against the errors of the 'Giants,' who had rebelled against gods. Plethon regards these Giants as the ones responsible for the extinction of fundamental beliefs in the hierarchy of gods and the eternity of the universe in the Hellenic world – he hints here that the 'Giants' were the Christian intellectuals of Late Antiquity and the Byzantine era.⁶²⁶ Couretes, says Plethon, revived pagan truths against the impious and god-fighting men

621 Mau, *Sexti*, II, 135–36.

622 Demetracopoulos, *Πλήθων*, 87–88; id., "Georgios Gemistos – Plethon's Dependence," 320.

623 For this unacknowledged source of Plethon's, see Demetracopoulos, *Πλήθων*, 88.

624 Alexandre, *Πλήθωνος*, 26, 13–23.

625 Demetracopoulos, *Πλήθων*, 102–104; id., "Georgios Gemistos – Plethon's Dependence," 317–20.

626 See Tambrun-Krasker, *Pléthon*, 87–88; "Le prologue," 283.

λόγων τε ἀνάγκαις ἀναμφιλέκτων καὶ μάχῃ τῇ πρὸς τοὺς Γίγαντας κρατήσαντες τῶν τάναντία αἰρουμένων καὶ θνητὰ πάντα ἔξω τοῦ ἐνὸς τοῦ πρεσβυτάτου γεννῶντος τιθεμένων.⁶²⁷

(Couretes), by means of indisputable arguments characterized by logical necessity, combatted and prevailed over the Giants, who held the opposite views, believing that everything except for the unique, ultimate generator is mortal.

The Christian identity of the ‘Giants’ is obvious indeed; Plethon’s description of their doctrine of the temporality of the created world is strikingly close to a well-known Patristic declaration of the infinite distance between God and the world: ἄκτιστον πλὴν τῆς θείας φύσεώς ἐστιν οὐδέν (“There is nothing uncreated except the divine nature”).⁶²⁸ What is equally interesting is the verbally exclusive – as far as I was able to check – affinity between Plethon’s description of the Couretes’s weapons, i.e., the λόγων ἀνάγκαι ἀναμφιλέκτων, and Gregory Nazianzen’s mockery at the allegedly ἀναμφίλεκτοι λόγοι of the pagan sages (see *supra*, 335).⁶²⁹ Interesting as well is Plethon’s description of how Couretes encounter Christians;⁶³⁰ one can hardly resist the temptation to parallel the λόγων ἀνάγκαι ἀναμφιλέκτων with ὁ βέλτιστος τῶν ἀνθρώπων λόγων

627 Plethon, *Laws* I, 2 in Alexandre, op. cit., 30, 27–32, 3.

628 Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* II, 213, in Jaeger, *Gregorii*, I, 287, 13; tr. Hall in Karfíková et al., *Proceedings*, 105.

629 That Plethon was acquainted with Gregory Nazianzen’s writings is quite natural; on the dissemination of Nazianzen’s poems in Late Byzantium see Christos Simelidis, *Selected Poems of Gregory of Nazianzus: I.2.17, II.1.10, 19, 32* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2009), 66–74.

630 A possible antecedent to (or even the source of) Plethon’s use of ‘Giants’ as a covert reference to Christians is Marinus’s *Vita Procli* 15, 19–20 in Henri-Dominique Saffrey, Alain Philippe Segonds, Concetta Luna, ed., *Marinus. Proclus ou sur le bonheur* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002), 18. On the anti-Christian character of this passage see op. cit., 118–19, note 8 (cf. Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism*, 55). See also Marinus’s *Vita Procli* 30, 1–7 (in Saffrey et al., op. cit., 35–36), where Christians are depicted – possibly as an allusion to Giants – as “those who move even the immovable” (tr. Mark Edwards, *Neoplatonic Saints. The Lives of Plotinus and Proclus by their Students* [Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000], 105); cf. Edwards, op. cit., 105, note 332; id., “Where Greeks and Christians Meet: Two Incidents in Panopolis and Gaza,” in *The Philosopher and Society in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honour of Peter Brown*, ed. Andrew Smith (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2005), 189–202, at 198; Saffrey et al., op. cit., 165, n. 1. On Couretes as the bearers of the correct theological doctrines, see also Plethon’s *Laws* III, 43 (in Alexandre, op. cit., 252, 6–8).

καὶ δυσεξελεγκτότατος from Plato's *Phaedo* 85C8–9 (cf. *supra*, 263)⁶³¹ as well as the μάχη κρατήσαντες with Plato's description of the 'dialectician' as ὥσπερ ἐν μάχῃ διὰ πάντων ἐλέγχων διεξιὼν, μὴ κατὰ δόξαν ἀλλὰ κατ' οὐσίαν προθυμούμενος ἐλέγχειν, ἐν πᾶσι τοῦτοις ἀπὸ τῶ λόγῳ διαπορεύεται in his re-elaboration of this *Phaedo* passage in the *Republic* (534C1–3; cf. *supra*, 265–266).

Plethon was delighted in the Platonic supersession of Xenophanes's reluctance to subscribe with certainty to any doctrine. He rephrased this supersession so as to turn it against Nazianzen's conviction that every heathen thinker deplorably creates his own intellectual universe by means of ineffective arguments, and that the only way out of this impasse is Christian faith. And he embarked with confidence, optimism, and 'cataphatic' spirit to inquire into the deepest questions.⁶³²

Conclusions

1) Xenophanes's fr. B34 occupied a prominent place in the course of the ancient Greek philosophical and scientific thought. Interpreted and assimilated in various ways, it fertilized Scepticism, both Academic and Ephectic, whereas it instigated Plato to critically assimilate it so as to overcome its negative aspect, i.e. the idea that no real knowledge can be reached by man in this life.

2) Whether B34 formed the opening words of the Xenophanean lost writing *On Nature*, to which it belonged, or not, many authors (Alcmaeon; Protagoras; Pseudo-Hippocrates; Plato; probably Metrodorus; Aristotle; Varro; Plutarch; Gregory Nazianzen; Plethon) adopted one or more of its points in writing their own preliminary discourses on this or that subject matter, which, in most cases, regarded theology.

3) The Christian reception of Xenophanes's B34 opted for an 'internalist' reading of it, the reading offered by Sextus Empiricus. According to this reading, what makes our clear knowledge of the important things unattainable is the fact that humans can attain no awareness of the truth-value of any statement – not even of a true one. Still, Christians nuanced this interpretation in an 'externalist' way, since they accounted for our inability to reach certain

631 See also Plato's *Crito* 46B4–6 (Socrates speaking): "Εγὼ οὐ νῦν πρῶτον ἀλλὰ καὶ αἰεὶ τοιοῦτος οἶος τῶν ἐμῶν μηδενὶ ἄλλῳ πείθεσθαι ἢ τῷ λόγῳ ὃς ἂν μοι λογιζομένῳ βέλτιστος φαίνεται" (parallel noticed by Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism*, 177, n. 38).

632 See Tambrun-Klusker, *Pléthon: le retour*, 173–95; Demetrapoulos, *Πλήθων*, 101–102; id., "Georgios Gemistos – Plethon's Dependence," 317. Cf. Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism*, 182.

knowledge by alleging the *humana conditio* in both of its meanings: (a) the very construction (*condere*) of human nature, which is per se by far inferior to God and falls short of understanding God's wisdom as reflected in the Creation; and (b) the miserable condition of the postlapsarian human, for the Fall narrowed the limits of our restricted cognitive powers even more. The former was an idea implicit in the fragment itself and, in fact, had been explicitly stated by some heathen interpreters of B34 from the 2nd century BC on; as for the latter, it was added by the Christians themselves.

4) The 'pious' interpretation of B34 made it look like an equivalent of the allegedly equally 'pious' passage from Plato's *Timaeus* 28C3–5. To several Christian authors, these dicta, taken in this spirit, were mostly welcome.

5) Given the close connection of this fragment with fideism in the writings of many Christian intellectuals of the Patristic and Byzantine periods, we could have predicted that Plethon, the only anti-Christian thinker of Byzantium, would include the fragment in the preliminary *discours de la méthode* that opened his *chef-d'œuvre*. He did so in order to cancel its all-subversive epistemological implications and thus to restore the human potential for knowledge and happiness.⁶³³

633 My gratitude to Börje Bydén (University of Stockholm), John B. Burke (University of Melbourne), Giovanni Cerri (Roma Tre University), Athanasios Despotis (University of Bonn), Peter Gemeinhardt (University of Göttingen), Laura Gemmelli Marciano (University of Zurich), Guy Guldentops (University of Cologne), Pavlos Kalligas (University of Athens), George Karamanolis (University of Crete), James H. Leshner (University of Maryland), Andrew S. Malone (Melbourne), Roger David Scott (University of Melbourne), Alexander P.D. Mourelatos (University of Texas), Christos Simelidis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki), Paul G. Tuffin (formerly, University of Adelaide), and Iakovos Vasiliou (City University of New York) for comments on parts of this study as well as for their specialized guidance, which saved me from many errors. Many thanks to Alberto del Campo Echevaría (Madrid), too, for providing Spanish studies not easily accessible in Patras, as well as to Panaghiotis Athanasopoulos (University of Ioannina), Helene Alexandri (University of Ioannina), and Michael Konstantinou-Rizos (University of London) for providing some useful English books and articles.

Appendix

A List of Passages Explicitly Quoting and Certainly or Highly Probably Echoing Xenophanes's B34 (in Chronological Order)

Columns 1–3 indicate name of author, his work and its edition, and date of the work. Since, as seen in this study, there are many cases of indirect or mediated reception of B34 (cf. Column 5), authors are listed in chronological order.

Column 4 describes succinctly the mode of literary reception. The set of categories used are (simple or doxographic quotation, close or loose adaptation, extensive or abridged adaptation, close or loose allusion, close or loose reminiscence, and conflation) an adaptation and enrichment of the set used by Carroll D. Osborn for a similar (yet not identical) case.⁶³⁴

Column 5 indicates whether reception was direct or indirect. By 'direct' I do not necessarily mean that an author had direct access to the lost Xenophanean work where B34 occurred, but that he had direct access to some source that provided him with an accurate reproduction of the fragment, i.e. a reproduction that was practically identical with Sextus Empiricus's version of the fragment (see *supra*, 246).

Column 6 informs the reader whether Xenophanes's name is mentioned by the author or not. In case that the recipient alludes to Xenophanes in an implicit way, this is indicated, too.

Column 7 indicates the name of the scholar who suggested that this or that passage is connected with B34 as well as the year of his relevant publication. More information is offered in the correspondent paragraph of this study. Passages included in Karsten's edition of Xenophanes's fragments (see *supra*, n. 9) are marked as (K); passages included in Diels/Kranz's standard collection (see *supra*, n. 9) are marked as (D/K).

Column 8 indicates which part of B34 is quoted, adapted etc.

Column 9 indicates if B34 is integrated to some discussion of the epistemological issues it raises or not, i.e. if the argument context of the integrating text is philosophical or theological (which is the nature of Xenophanes's discussion) or not.

Column 10 expresses the present author's view as to the degree of certainty to which we can claim that each particular case is a real case of reception of B34 (certain, probable or possible).

634 Carroll D. Osborn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism," in *Novum Testamentum* 47, 4 (2005): 313–43, at 318; 332–40. Osborn's research is *Überlieferung*-oriented, my interest here is in the reverse direction, i.e. it is reception-oriented. Still, both types of research call for elaborating a set of categories of reception of passages through the history of literature.

	Author	Work and edition	Date	Literary kind of reception
1	Alcmaeon of Croto	<i>On Nature</i> , fr. B1, 3–5 (D/K I, 214, 25–27)	second half of the 6th–first half of the 5th cent. BC	allusion and literary imitation
2	Protagoras	<i>On Gods</i> , fr. B4 (D/K II, 265, 7–9)	ca. mid-5th cent. BC	allusion
3a	Aristophanes	<i>Clouds</i> 250–1 (Dover 1968, 19)	424/3 or 420/17 BC	allusion
3b	Aristophanes	<i>Clouds</i> 342–3 (Dover 1968, 24–5)	424/3 or 420/17 BC	allusion
4	Ps.-Hippocrates	<i>De prisca medicina</i> I, 1 and 3 (Jouanna 1990, 118, 1–7; 119, 5–11)	late 5th or early 4th cent. BC	close and extensive adaptation
5	Thucydides	<i>Historiae</i> v, 105, 2 (Jones and Powell 1902, 104, 10–11)	late 5th cent. or 396/5 BC	reminiscence
6a	Plato	<i>Apologia Socratis</i> 42A2–5	most probably 393/2 BC	loose reminiscence
6b	Plato	<i>Phaedo</i> 69D4–6	shortly after 388/7 BC	reminiscence
6c	Plato	<i>Phaedo</i> 85C1–3	shortly after 388/7 BC	adaptation
6d	Plato	<i>Cratylus</i> 425C1–3	probably ca. 387/5 BC	abridged adaptation
6e	Plato	<i>Meno</i> 80D5–8	386/5 BC	allusion
6f	Plato	<i>Meno</i> 97A9–B10	386/5 BC	loose reminiscence
6g	Plato	<i>Timaeus</i> 29C4–29D2	ca. 360 BC	extensive adaptation

Direct / indirect reception	Xenophanes's name mentioned: yes / no	Scholar	Fullness / partiality	Argument context (in / out of)	Status (to the present author's view): certain / probable / possible
presumably direct	N	Reinhardt 1916	part of vv. 1–2; 4	in	probable
presumably direct	N	Zeppi 1961	vv. 1–2	in	probable
presumably direct	N	Lesher 2010 (unpublished)	vv. 1–2 in part	in	certain
presumably partly direct; probably conflated with No 2	N	<i>supra</i> , 258	vv. 1–2	in	probable
direct	N	Fränkel 1925 (Pohlenz suggerente)	full	in	certain
unknown	N	Fränkel 1925	v. 4 in part	out of	probable
unknown	N	Lesher 1992	v. 1 in part	loosely in	possible
unknown	N	Lesher 1987; 1992	v. 1–2	in	possible
presumably direct	N	Lesher 1992	vv. 1–2	in	certain
presumably direct	N	<i>supra</i> , n. 87	vv. 1–2; 4 in part	out of	certain
possibly direct	N	Fränkel 1925; D/K; cf. Palmer 1999	vv. 3–4	in	probable
unknown	N	Lesher 2010 (unpublished)	vv. 3–4	in	possible
presumably direct	N	Mourelatos 2010; Bryan 2012; cf. Guetter 1997	vv. 1–2; 4	in	certain

Table (cont.)

	Author	Work and edition	Date	Literary kind of reception
6h	Plato	<i>Critias</i> 106C1–107B4	ca. 360 BC	extensive adaptation
7	Isocrates	<i>Nicocles</i> 26, 4–5 (Mathieu and Brémond 1938, 126–7)	probably 372/65 BC	close and abridged adaptation
8	Metrodorus of Chios	DK A23, II 234, 1–12	mid-4th cent. BC	close and abridged adaptation; conflation with some version of Socrates's ignorance dictum
9a	Aristotle	<i>Metaphysics</i> III, 1, 3, 995a33–b1	probably sometime between 367 and 347 BC	loose allusion
9b	Aristotle	<i>Poetics</i> 25, 1460b35–1461a1	probably sometime before 360 BC	loose allusion
9c	Aristotle	<i>Posterior Analytics</i> I, 9, 76a26	probably sometime before 360 BC	reminiscence
10a	Cicero	<i>Academica</i> I, 12, 44 (Plasberg 1922, 19, 7–8)	45 BC	loose and abridged allusion
10b	Cicero	<i>Academica</i> II, 23, 74 (Plasberg 1922, 63, 3–7)	45 BC	loose reminiscence

Direct / indirect reception	Xenophanes's name mentioned: yes / no	Scholar	Fullness / partiality	Argument context (in / out of)	Status (to the present author's view): certain / probable / possible
presumably direct	N	Mourelatos 2010	vv. 1–2; 4	out of	certain
presumably direct	N	Demetracopoulos 2004	vv. 1–2 in part; 4 in part	out of	certain
direct	N	D/K (cautiously); Tor 2013 (on adaptation); <i>supra</i> , 275 (on the relevance with Socrates's dictum)	vv. 1; 4	in	certain
probably direct	N	Laks 2009	vv. 3–4 in part	in	probable
unknown	Y	Victorius 1560	vv. 2; 4	out of	possible
possibly via No 6e	N	Markos 1983; 1990; 1994	vv. 1 in part; 4 in part	out of	possible
possibly via a lost quotation, adaptation, or interpretation by Arcesilaus	N	Brittain and Palmer 2001	v. 4	in	probable
possibly via a lost quotation, adaptation, or interpretation by Arcesilaus	Y	Brittain 2006 (cf. D/K)	v. 1	in	probable

Table (cont.)

	Author	Work and edition	Date	Literary kind of reception
11 a	Varro	<i>Antiquitates rerum divinarum</i> , fr. 204, 1–2 (Cardauns 1976, 89)	mid-1st cent. BC	reminiscence
11 b	Varro	<i>Antiquitates rerum divinarum</i> , fr. 228, 3–5 (Cardauns 1976, 98)	mid-1st cent. BC	quotation
12	Arius Didymus	<i>Liber de philosophorum sectis</i> (Mullach 1867, 53b16–20 = A24 in D/K, 116, 9–12)	1st cent. BC	quotation
13	Seneca	<i>Naturales quaestiones</i> VII, 29, 3 (Hine 1996, 316–7)	65 AD	reminiscence

Direct / indirect reception	Xenophanes's name mentioned: yes / no	Scholar	Fullness / partiality	Argument context (in / out of)	Status (to the present author's view): certain / probable / possible
indirect: via some unknown (3rd/2nd cent. BC Academic?), re-elaboration	N	Cardauns 1976; cf. <i>supra</i> , 281	vv. 1–3; 4 in part	in	probable
indirect: via some unknown (3rd/2nd cent. BC Academic?), re-elaboration	Y	Deichgräber 1938; Dombart and Kalb 1955; Cardauns 1976	v. 4 in part	in	certain
indirect: via some unknown (3rd/2nd cent. BC Academic?), re-elaboration; conflated with Plato's <i>Phaedrus</i> 278D3–6 and/or <i>Phaedo</i> 66C2	Y	K; D/K; on conflation, see K	vv. 1–2 in part; 4 in part	in	certain
indirect: via some unknown (3rd/2nd cent. BC Academic?) re-elaboration	N	Inwood 2002	vv. 1 in part; 4 in part	in	certain

Table (cont.)

	Author	Work and edition	Date	Literary kind of reception
14	Philo of Alexandria	<i>De ebrietate</i> 166 (Wendland 1896, 202, 6–8)	first half of the 1st cent. AD	loose allusion
15a	Plutarch of Chaeronea	<i>Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat</i> 17E7–F1	late 1st–early 2nd cent. AD	quotation
15b	Plutarch of Chaeronea	<i>De sera numinis vindicta</i> 549E5–F2	late 1st–early 2nd cent. AD	abridged allusion
15c	Plutarch of Chaeronea	<i>De sera numinis vindicta</i> 558D5–9	late 1st–early 2nd cent. AD	loose and extensive allusion
16a	Sextus Empiricus	<i>Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes</i> II, 18 (Mau 1958, 68)	ca. 100 AD / first half of the 3rd cent. AD	doxographic quotation
16b	Sextus Empiricus	<i>Adversus Mathematicos</i> VII, 49 (Mutschmann 1914, 12)	ca. 100 AD / first half of the 3rd cent. AD	doxographic quotation
16c	Sextus Empiricus	<i>Adversus Mathematicos</i> VII, 110 (Mutschmann 1914, 25)	ca. 100 AD / first half of the 3rd cent. AD	doxographic quotation
16d	Sextus Empiricus	<i>Adversus Mathematicos</i> VIII, 326 (Mutschmann 1914, 178)	ca. 100 AD / first half of the 3rd cent. AD	doxographic quotation
17	Galen	<i>De differentia pulsuum</i> III, 1 (Kühn 1824, 636, 9–637, 2)	second half of the 2nd cent. AD	quotation

Direct / indirect reception	Xenophanes's name mentioned: yes / no	Scholar	Fullness / partiality	Argument context (in / out of)	Status (to the present author's view): certain / probable / possible
probably direct	N	<i>supra</i> , 292	vv. 1–2 in part	in	certain
direct	Y	K; D-K	vv. 1–2 in full	out of	certain
indirect: via some source close to No 12	N	<i>supra</i> , 295–296	vv. 1–4 in part	in	certain
indirect: via some source close to No 12	N	<i>supra</i> , 294	vv. 1–4 in part	in	certain
direct	Y	K; D/K	v. 4 in part	in	certain
direct	Y	K; D/K	full	in	certain
direct	Y	K; D/K	full	in	certain
direct	Y	K; D/K	full	in	certain
presumably direct	“... the philosopher who said...”	K; D/K	vv. 3–4	out of	certain

Table (cont.)

	Author	Work and edition	Date	Literary kind of reception
18	Ps.-Galen	<i>De historia philosophica</i> 3 (Kühn 1830, 234, 6–7 = Diels 1879, 604, 17–18 (= D/K A35, I 123, 16–17)	second half of the 2nd cent. AD	loose doxographic quotation
19	Theophilus of Antioch	<i>Ad Autolyicum</i> II, 12 (Grant 1970, 44–46)	shortly after 180 AD	allusion
20	Hippolytus of Rome	<i>Refutatio omnium haeresium</i> I, 14, 1 (Marcovich 1986, 73)	late 2nd / early 3rd cent. AD	doxographic quotation
21	Quintus Smyrnaeus	<i>Posthomerica</i> VI, 433–4 (Vian 1966, 84)	second half of the 3rd cent. AD	literary imitation
22	Diogenes Laertius	<i>Vitae philosophorum</i> IX, 72 (Marcovich 1999, 683, 6–8)	3rd cent. AD	doxographic quotation
23	Porphry of Tyre	<i>Commentary on Plato's "Phaedo"</i> (lost) apud Macrobius's <i>Commentarii in Ciceronis "Somnium Scipionis"</i> I, 12, 9 (Willis 1994, 49, 17–22)	second half of the 3rd cent. AD	loose and extensive adaptation
24a; b; c; d	Lactantius	<i>Divinae institutiones</i> III, 1, 2; 1, 16; 3, 1–2; 3, 11 (Brandt 1890, 177, 15–17; 179, 18–20; 181, 12–15; 183, 3–5)	probably 313 AD	extensive reminiscence
24e	Lactantius	<i>Divinae institutiones</i> VI, 18, 1 (Brandt 1890, 547, ll. 1–4)	probably 313 AD	loose reminiscence

Direct / indirect reception	Xenophanes's name mentioned: yes / no	Scholar	Fullness / partiality	Argument context (in / out of)	Status (to the present author's view): certain / probable / possible
unknown	Y	D/K	vv. 1–2 in part	out of	certain
unknown	N	<i>supra</i> , 306–307	vv. 2–3	in	probable
presumably direct	Y	K; D/K	vv. 3–4	out of	certain
presumably direct	N	<i>supra</i> , 209	v. 4 in part	out of	certain
presumably direct	Y	K; D/K	v. 1	out of	certain
presumably direct	N	<i>supra</i> , 327	vv. 2; 4	in	certain
indirect: via some source close to Varro's (No 11b) and Seneca's (No 13) version	N	<i>supra</i> , 316; 317	vv. 1–2 in part; v. 4	in	probable
indirect; most probably conflated with Cicero, No 10b		<i>supra</i> , 319; on the Ciceronian provenance, see Bryce 1990	v. 1	in	probable

Table (cont.)

	Author	Work and edition	Date	Literary kind of reception
24f	Lactance	<i>De ira Dei</i> I, 4, 14–19	probably 316 AD?	allusion
25a	Arnobius of Sicca	<i>Adversus Nationes</i> II, 7 (Marchesi 1953, 71, 22–73, 18)	probably 302/5	allusion
25b	Arnobius of Sicca	<i>Adversus Nationes</i> II, 57 (Marchesi 1953, 132, 5–13)	probably 302/5	allusion
26	Ps.-Clement of Rome	<i>Homilia</i> II 6, 3; 7, 2–4 (Strecker and Rehm 1989, 38, 2–5; 38, 12–20)	mid-4th cent. AD	reminiscence
27a; b	Marius Victorinus	<i>Explanationes in Ciceronis "Rhetoricam"</i> I, 29 (Ippolito 2006, 137, 57–138, 65; 141, 183–142, 205)	late first half of the 4th cent. AD	reminiscence
28a	Gregory Nazianzen	<i>Oratio XXVIII</i> 17, 1–2 (Gallay and Jourjon 1978, 134)	380 AD	reminiscence
28b	Gregory Nazianzen	<i>Oratio XXVIII</i> 17, 11–13 (Gallay and Jourjon 1978, 136)	380 AD	reminiscence

Direct / indirect reception	Xenophanes's name mentioned: yes / no	Scholar	Fullness / partiality	Argument context (in / out of)	Status (to the present author's view): certain / probable / possible
indirect: probably via No 11b and/or No 13	N	Ingremeau 1982 (on Seneca); <i>supra</i> , 318 (on Varro)	vv. 1 in part; 4 in part	in	certain
presumably direct	N	<i>supra</i> , 321	vv. 3–4	in	probable
partly direct; partly indirect: most probably via Lactantius's (No 24a–d) and Porphyry's allusion (No 23)	N	<i>supra</i> , 322	vv. 3–4	in	probable
unknown	N	<i>supra</i> , 309	vv. 3–4 in part	in	probable
unknown	N	<i>supra</i> , 325	v. 4	out of	probable
unknown; probably conflated with No 6g	N	<i>supra</i> , 337	vv. 1–2	in	certain
probably direct	N	<i>supra</i> , 337–338	v. 3	in	certain

Table (cont.)

	Author	Work and edition	Date	Literary kind of reception
29	Epiphanius of Salamis	<i>Adversus haereses</i> , "De fide" (Holl 1933, 505, 25–7)	second half of the 4th cent. AD	doxographic quotation
30	Ps.-Justin (<i>revera</i> Theodoret of Cyrus)	<i>Expositio rectae fidei</i> 8 (Otto 1880, 28 = Morel, 379B7–C5)	first half of the 5th cent. AD	doxographic quotation
31a; b; c	Ps.-Justin	<i>Confutatio dogmatum quorundam Aristotelicorum</i> (Otto 1880, 100; 104; 116 = Morel, 110E; 111D–112A; 117D–118E)	probably first half of the 5th cent. AD	reminiscence
32	Proclus	<i>In Platonis "Timaeum" commentaria</i> II (Diehl 1903, 254, 20–23)	second half of the 5th cent. AD	doxographic quotation
33	Olympiodorus Deacon	<i>Commentarii in "Ecclesiasten"</i> (PG 93: 584A13–B14)	early 6th cent. AD	adaptation
34a	Nicephoros Gregoras	<i>Epistle xxxiv</i> , 59–61 (Leone 1982, 128–9)	probably 1328/32	adaptation
34b	Nicephoros Gregoras	<i>Epistle III</i> , 166–7 (Leone 1982, 25–6)	after 1347	reminiscence

Direct / indirect reception	Xenophanes's name mentioned: yes / no	Scholar	Fullness / partiality	Argument context (in / out of)	Status (to the present author's view): certain / probable / possible
partly direct; partly conflated with some version that echoes No 1	Y	K; on the resemblance with Alcmaeon, see <i>supra</i> , 253	v. 4	out of	certain
partly direct; combined with 6g	"somebody"	<i>supra</i> , 345	v. 1–2 in part	in	certain
indirect: probably via some passage such as No 19 and No 26	N	<i>supra</i> , 346	vv. 2–3	in	probable
presumably direct	Y	K; D/K	v. 4 in part	out of	certain
probably direct; combined with Joh. 1:2 and I Cor. 13:9; conflated with Eccles. 8:17	N	<i>supra</i> , 349	vv. 1 in part; 3–4 in part	in	probable
direct; inspired by and combined with No 14	N	<i>supra</i> , 359	vv. 1–2	in	certain
probably direct	N	<i>supra</i> , 361, n. 393	vv. 1–2	in	possible

Table (cont.)

	Author	Work and edition	Date	Literary kind of reception
35	Gregory Palamas	<i>Ad Dionysium monachum epistula</i> 1 (Matsoukas 1966, 479, 13–6)	probably 1344	doxographic quotation
36a; b	Manuel II Palaiologos	<i>Dialogus cum Persa mahometano</i> VIII; IX (Trapp 1966, 103, 3–6; 103, 37–8; 104, 3–6; 106, 39–40)	shortly before 1400	adaptation
37	George Gemistos or Plethon	<i>Laws</i> I, 3 (Alexandre 1858, 40, 5–8; 40, 19–22)	probably some time between ca. 1425 and 1438/9	close adaptation
38	George Scholarios - Gennadios II	<i>Contra Plethonis ignorationem circa Aristotelem</i> (Petit, Sideridès and Jugie 1935, 21, 3–5)	1443/4	adaptation

Direct / indirect reception	Xenophanes's name mentioned: yes / no	Scholar	Fullness / partiality	Argument context (in / out of)	Status (to the present author's view): certain / probable / possible
direct (based on No 20 and, possibly, No 16); conflation with No 8	Y	<i>supra</i> , 369	vv. 1 in part; 4 in part	out of	certain
indirect (based on No 12); conflated with 6a	N	<i>supra</i> , 404–405	vv. 1–2 in part; 4 in part	in	certain
direct (based on No 16); conflated with No 15b	“some”	Demetracopoulos 2002; 2004; 2006	vv. 1–2	in	certain
direct (presumably based on No 16); conflated with Sap. Sol. 3:22 as quoted in Demetrios Cydones's translation of Thomas Aquinas's <i>Summa theologiae</i> , Ia, q. 1, a. 1, arg. 1, co. and ad 1um	N	Demetracopoulos 2004; 2006	vv. 1–2	in	certain

Lactantius Philosophus?

Reading, Misreading, and Exploiting Lactantius from Antiquity to the Early Renaissance

David Rutherford

This study examines the philosophical reflections of Firmianus Lactantius (ca. 250–ca. 325) and the reactions of his readers from the fourth through the early sixteenth century. Starting with a review of his own concerns and intentions, it explores the circulation, influence, adaptations, and reappraisals of his writings on philosophy up to the stage when his texts became ubiquitous. How did readers assess his statements about philosophy? What use did they make of them? Did they consider him a philosopher? If so, of what capabilities? If they did not think of him as a philosopher, what did they take him to be? How did their perceptions of his status shape their analysis of his philosophical reasonings? As will become clear, his status as a philosopher or even his place in the history of ideas varied with changing notions of the nature, purpose, and value of philosophy. He addressed such questions himself: “There have been philosophers of remarkable literary learning,” he said, “but I would not yield place to them for knowledge and understanding of the truth: no one can achieve truth simply by thinking and arguing.” He continued: “I cast no slur on their desire to know the truth, since man’s great greed to acquire it is the doing of God; what I object to, after all that fine and excellent intention of theirs, is the utter lack of product due to their complete ignorance of what truth is and of how, where, and in what frame of mind to seek it.”¹

1 *Inst.* 3.1.6–7. All translations of the *Institutes* here are by Anthony Bowen and Peter Garnsey, trans. with intro. and notes, Lactantius, *Divine Institutes* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2003). The critical texts of Lactantius used here are: *Divinarum institutionum libri septem*, eds. Eberhard Heck and Antonie Wlosok, Bibliotheca Teubneriana (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2005–2011); *Epitome diuinarum institutionum*, eds. Heck and Wlosok, Bibliotheca Teubneriana (Leipzig: Teubner, 1994); *De opificio dei / L’ouvrage du Dieu créateur*, ed. and trans. Michel Perrin, Sources Chrétiennes 213–214 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974); *De ira dei / La Colère de Dieu*, ed. and trans. Christiane Ingreneau, Sources Chrétiennes 289 (Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1982).

A number of excellent studies have analyzed Lactantius's views and use of philosophy.² The classic work is René Pichon's *Lactance: Étude sur le mouvement philosophique et religieux sous le règne de Constantin* (1901). It raised a question that continues to engage scholars working on Lactantius's writings on philosophy: how do we account for his ostensible failure to confront the philosophic currents of his own day? This question is most pronounced in his silence on Neoplatonism and his preoccupation with Epicureanism. The latter, in the view of modern scholars, was essentially moribund by the late third and early fourth century.³ This question does not arise regarding his interest in Hermetic philosophy, which Antonie Wlosok explored in her *Laktanz und die*

2 For L. and philosophy broadly, see Jackson Bryce, *The Library of Lactantius* (New York-London: Garland Publishing, 1990), 19–87; Stephen Casey, "Lactantius's Reaction to Pagan Philosophy," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 32 (1980): 203–19; Blandine Colot and Bruno Bureau, "Le thème de la philosophie païenne dans la polémique chrétienne de Lactance à Augustin," in *La parole polémique*, Gilles Declercq, Michel Murat, and Jacqueline Dangel, eds. (Paris: Champion, 2003), 57–102, esp. 58–72; Elizabeth DePalma Digeser, *The Making of a Christian Empire: Lactantius and Rome* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 64–90; Olof Gigon, "Lactantius und die Philosophie," in *Kerygma und Logos: Beiträge zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für C. Andresen*, ed. Adolf Martin Ritter (Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1979), 196–213; Alain Goulon, "Lactance et les philosophes: réfutation ou dialogue?" in *Les chrétiens face à leurs adversaires dans l'Occident latin au IV^e siècle*, ed. Jean-Michel Poinssotte (Rouen: Publications de l'Université, 2001), 13–22; Jean-Yves Guillaumin, "Arts libéraux et philosophie chez Lactance (*Institutiones divines* 3.25)," in *Autour de Lactance: Hommages à Pierre Monat*, eds. Jean-Yves Guillaumin and Stéphane Ratti, (Paris: Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté, [2003]), 27–42; Vincenzo Loi, *Lattanzio nella storia del linguaggio e del pensiero teologico pre-niceno*, Bibliotheca theologica salesiana, ser. I, Fontes, 5 (Zurich: Pas-Verlag, 1970); Barbara Faes de Mottoni, "Lattanzio e gli Accademici," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome, Antiquité* 94 (1982): 335–77; Michel Perrin, *L'homme antique et chrétien: l'anthropologie de Lactance*, 250–325, *Théologie Historique* 59 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1981); and Jochen Walter, *Pagane Texte und Wertvorstellungen bei Laktanz* (Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 2006), 130–51. For L. and particular philosophers, see Peter A. Roots, "The *De opificio dei*: The Workmanship of God and Lactantius," *Classical Quarterly* 37 (1987): 466–86; Michel Perrin, "Le Platon de Lactance," *Lactance et son temps: Recherches actuelles: Actes du IV^e colloque d'études historiques et patristiques, Chantilly, 21–23 septembre 1976*, eds. Jacques Fontaine and Michel Perrin, *Théologie Historique* 48 (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1978), 203–34; for L. and Porphyry see here, nn. 75 and 76.

3 For L. and Epicureanism, see Stefan Freund, "Laktanz und die epikureische Seelenlehre," *Studia patristica* 42 (2006): 379–84; Alain Goulon, "Une présentation personnelle de l'épicurisme par Lactance (*Inst.* 3.17): objectivité, habileté ou rouerie?" in *Autour de Lactance*, 17–25; Eberhard Heck, "Nochmals: Lactantius und Lucretius. Antilucrezisches im Epilog des laktanzischen Phoenix-Gedichts?" *Journal of the Classical Tradition* 9 (2003): 509–23; and

philosophische Gnosis (1960). Wlosok's study made a significant contribution to scholarship on Hermetic philosophy. Questions about the significance of Hermetic elements in Lactantius's thought and many other issues have since motivated scholars to take another look at Lactantius's writings on philosophy. In this growing body of scholarship two traits continue to surface, even if they are only sometimes analyzed. First is the eclectic nature of his philosophic material, and second is the rhetorical context in which he deployed it.⁴ A question frequently confronted is whether he was hostile to all philosophy or only to some schools or aspects of philosophy. Additionally, scholars have questioned whether his objections to philosophy reflect his actual practice. For example, apart from Lactantius's criticisms of Stoic philosophy and of particular Stoics, Stephen Casey has demonstrated that Lactantius was well versed in Stoic logic and employed it frequently.⁵

According to varying estimates, Lactantius was born in North Africa possibly as early as 250.⁶ His city of origin remains unknown. He studied rhetoric under Arnobius of Sicca, when both teacher and pupil were still pagan.⁷ For some

Tadeusz Maslowski, "The Opponents of Lactantius [Inst. VII.7.7–13]," *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 7 (1974): 187–213.

- 4 See for example Casey, "Lactantius's Reaction," 203–05, 219; Pichon, *Lactance* 284–334; Wlosok, "Lactance," 438–39. For the rhetorical context of Lactantius's Hermetic and Sibylline material, see here n. 74.
- 5 Casey, "Lactantius's Reaction," 213–14; see also Ursino Dominguez del Val, "El senequismo de Lactancio," *Helmantica* 23 (1972): 289–323.
- 6 Estimates for L.'s date of birth range from ca. 250 (Wlosok) to ?260–?270 (Barnes). For L.'s biography, see now Timothy D. Barnes, *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 8–9, 176–178; Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), 12–14, 291–92; Barnes, "Lactantius and Constantine," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 63 (1973): 29–46; Digeser, *Christian Empire*; and James Stevenson, "The Life and Literary Activity of Lactantius," *Studia Patristica* 1 (1957): 661–677. For excellent surveys with crucial bibliographies, see Christiane Ingreneau, "Lactantius," *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, IV, *de Labeo à Ovidius*, ed. Richard Goulet (Paris: CNRS, 2005), 65–71; Antonie Wlosok's, "Lactance (L. Caelius ou Cae(c)ilius Firmianus Lactantius)," in *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine*, V, gen. eds. Reinhart Herzog and Peter Lebrecht Schmidt (Paris: Brepols, 1993), §570, at 426–59. For a discussion of the gaps in the evidence for Constantine's life and for the members of his court, see Timothy D. Barnes, "Was there a Constantinian Revolution?" *Journal of Late Antiquity* 2 (2009): 374–84, esp. 376–80.
- 7 See Oliver Nicholson, "Arnobius and Lactantius," *Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, eds. Oliver Nicholson, Frances Young, Andrew Louth, and Lewis Ayres (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 259–65; and Mark Edwards, "The Flowering of Latin Apologetic: Lactantius and Arnobius," in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christian*, eds. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 197–221.

years, he too taught rhetoric somewhere in North Africa. In the mid 290s the emperor Diocletian summoned him to fill the official chair of Latin rhetoric in the newly founded eastern capital, Nicomedia (in Bithynia).⁸ Lactantius – now perhaps in his mid-40s – attained this position on the merits of his notable rhetorical skill and also, presumably, through the influence of former students or acquaintances who had reached the highest levels of imperial government.⁹ His invitation to Nicomedia rested on his pre-Christian achievements and writings. He continued to be known for these works throughout his life and for several generations thereafter. His surviving works, with two possible exceptions, were all written after he converted to Christianity.¹⁰ Lactantius described these early years in Nicomedia as filled with Diocletian's "limitless passion for building" made possible by a "limitless scouring of the provinces." For Lactantius this attempt "to make Nicomedia the equal of the city of Rome" came close to madness.¹¹ Yet he indicated little awareness that Diocletian's restless aggrandizement of his new capital explained his own presence in Nicomedia.¹² Indeed, Lactantius too had been "scoured from the provinces."

-
- 8 Hier. *Vir. ill.* 80: "...sub Diocletiano principe accitus cum Fabio (i.e., Flavio) grammatico...Nicomediae rhetoricam docuit ac penuria discipulorum ob Graecam uidelicet ciuitatem ad scribendum se contulit."
 - 9 See Oliver Nicholson, "*Caelum potius intuemini*: Lactantius and the Statue of Constantine," *Studia Patristica* 34 (2001): 177–96, esp. 184–85 and n. 42, who points out that "L. has the distinction of being the earliest surviving Christian writer known to have been involved in the world of imperial politics" (184). See also Roots, "The *De opificio dei*," 466–86, esp. 466–67. On L.'s high-level connections, see here n. 64.
 - 10 One possible exception is L.'s *Phoenix*. For the difficulties in determining whether L. wrote it when still a pagan or after becoming a Christian, see Jackson Bryce, "Lactantius' *De ave Phoenix* and the Religious Policy of Constantine the Great," *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989): 13–19. Another surviving pre-Christian work of L., if Anne Friedrich's recent hypothesis proves to be correct, is L.'s *Symposium*; see Friedrich, *Das Symposium der XII Sapientes: Kommentar und Verfasserfrage* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), esp. 479–508.
 - 11 Lact. *Mort. Pers.* 7.8–10. Translation from Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*, ed. and trans. John L. Creed (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984). For the date of the *De mortibus* see Barnes, "Lactantius and Constantine," 29–46, esp. 39; and Wlosok, "Lactance," 451.
 - 12 L. didn't live to see Constantine's building program for Constantinople. Maybe he would have approved since in this instance the emperor, in some significant measure, defrayed the costs through plundering the pagan temples and sanctuaries in the East for their treasures and statues, transferring the best as ornaments for his new city and reducing the rest to coinage to pay his army and his builders. See Giorgio Bonamente, "Sulla confisca dei beni mobili de templi in epoca costantiniana," in *Costantino il Grande dall'antichità all'umanesimo, Colloquio sul Cristianesimo nel mondo antico*, Macerata 18–20 dicembre 1990, eds. Giorgio Bonamente and Franca Fusco, 2 vols. (Macerata: Università degli Studi di Macerata, 1992–93), 1: 171–201; Ramsay MacMullen, *Constantine* (New York: The Dial

Our limited evidence suggests that Lactantius did not convert to Christianity until well into adulthood, perhaps only after he arrived in Nicomedia.¹³ If, as with Augustine, philosophy played a part in his conversion to Christianity, the traces are difficult to detect. Hermetic philosophy may have influenced him before his conversion; he believed it might persuade others of the Christian truth. Some Neoplatonic and Zoroastrian ideas, probably of indirect origin, similarly had some resonance with him.¹⁴ Plausibly, he spent some years before his conversion as a monotheistic or perhaps a henotheistic pagan with certain sympathies toward Christian teaching, like the individuals to whom he appealed in his *Divine Institutes*.¹⁵ When he says that all philosophers found some part of the truth, but the truth that had eluded them could only be found in divine teaching, he may well be describing his own intellectual and spiritual quest.¹⁶ He was familiar with the work of the North African apologists: Tertullian, Minucius Felix, and Cyprian. It is probable that he began reading

Press, 1969; London: Croom Helm, 1987), 150–156, 190–191; and Kevin Wilkinson, “Palladas and the Age of Constantine,” *The Journal of Roman Studies* 99 (2009): 51 n. 99 and 55 n. 119.

- 13 See Wlosok, “Lactance,” 428–430, and Wlosok, *Laktanz*, 191–192, who thinks L. converted in Nicomedia. Cf. Paul McGuckin, “The Non-Cyprianic Scripture Texts in Lactantius’ *Divine Institutes*,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1982): 145–163, esp. 155–156, argues that L.’s knowledge of scripture strongly urges the conclusion that he converted in Africa.
- 14 Wlosok, *Lactanz*, esp. 180–246; Garth Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), esp. 8, 38–9, and 205–11; and Brian P. Copenhaver, *Hermetica: The Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), esp. xxvii, xxxi–xxxii, xliii. See here also n. 74.
- 15 Oliver Nicholson, “*Civitas quae adhuc sustentat omnia*: Lactantius and the City of Rome,” in *The Limits of Ancient Christianity: Essays on Late Antique Thought and Culture in Honor of R.A. Markus* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999), 7–25. On the difficulty of finding neutral terms for ‘pagans’ and ‘pagan monotheists,’ see Polymnia Athanassiadi, “Introduction,” in *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, eds. Polymnia Athanassiadi and Michael Frede, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 1–20; Jeremy Schott, “Porphyry on Christians and Others: ‘Barbarian Wisdom,’ Identity Politics, and Anti-Christian Polemics on the Eve of the Great Persecution,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 13 (2005): 277–314; Schott, “Porphyry, Lactantius, and ‘Pagan Monotheists,’” *Studia Patristica* 40 (2006): 239–44; and Michael Frede, “Monotheism and Pagan Philosophy in later Antiquity,” in *Pagan Monotheism*, 41–67. Schott (“Porphyry, Lactantius,” 239–44) argues that the dichotomy (polytheistic / monotheistic) is insufficient to account for the antimony between Christians and Platonists, especially for writers like Lactantius and Porphyry. Schott thinks a better explanation is that both advanced “competing perennial philosophies,” that is, “a universal philosophic and religious truth that transcended cultural particularity” (241).
- 16 *Inst.* 7.7.14.

them and Christian Scriptures while still in North Africa.¹⁷ He thought these North African apologists made a poor impression on educated pagans, which perhaps reveals his reaction to having read them while still a pagan himself.¹⁸ In *The Workmanship of God*, written at the outset of the persecution in 303, he alluded vaguely to other educated Christians as “philosophers of our sect,” a designation he soon dropped.¹⁹

When he arrived in Nicomedia, roughly forty years of relative peace had prevailed between Christians and non-Christians. Decius’s and Valerian’s persecutions would have ended approximately when Lactantius was born.²⁰ In halting the persecution, the emperor Gallienus in 260 recognized Christianity as a lawful religion and gave Christians the right to possess their own places of worship.²¹ But shortly after Lactantius’s arrival in Nicomedia, the situation for Christians deteriorated. With the onset of the ‘Great Persecution’ in 303, he presumably resigned his position perforce and went into hiding, some think in the West.²² Wherever he took refuge, in the years between 305 and 311 he wrote his *Divine Institutes*, which demonstrate considerable knowledge of Christian Scriptures and teaching.²³ Could he have acquired this range of Christian knowledge only after arriving in Nicomedia? Perhaps.

-
- 17 See here n. 13. It is usually maintained that L. never indicated any awareness of Arnobius’s *Adversus nationes*, written nearly simultaneously with his own *Institutes*. Michel Perrin, however, suggests that L. may have known of Arnobius’s work when he wrote his *Epitome* but he may not have wanted to acknowledge it (or even perhaps to recognize his former teacher): Perrin, “Lactance lecteur d’Arnobé dans l’*Epitome des Institutions*?” *Revue des études augustiniennes* 30 (1984): 36–41.
- 18 *Inst.* 5.1.22–28. See John A. McGuckin, “Does Lactantius Denigrate Cyprian?” *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 39 (1988): 119–24.
- 19 After he had written book 3 of the *Institutes*, a phrase like “philosophi nostrae sectae” (*Opif.* 1.2) would be conspicuously incongruous.
- 20 See Timothy D. Barnes, “Sossianus Hierocles and the Antecedents of the ‘Great Persecution,’” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80 (1976): 239–252, esp. 241.
- 21 Barnes, *Constantine*, 57 and 97.
- 22 See Oliver Nicholson, “Flight from Persecution as Imitation of Christ: Lactantius’s *Divine Institutes* IV.18.1–2,” *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 40 (1989): 48–65. Nicholson demonstrates that L. (like many) fled, but does not claim to know where, perhaps the local countryside. See here n. 49 for Barnes’s and Digeser’s contention that he fled to the West and Heck’s and Wlosok’s contention that he remained in Nicomedia.
- 23 See Paul McGuckin, “The Non-Cyprianic Scripture Texts,” 145–163; Pierre Monat, *Lactance et la Bible: Une propédeutique latine à la lecture de la Bible dans l’Occident constantinien* (Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1982); and Blandine Colot, “L’écriture de la Bible dans les *Institutions divines* de Lactance (250–325): Un apologiste face aux païens lettrés n’ayant que dédain pour le Texte sacré,” in *L’apologétique chrétienne: Expressions de la pensée*

Lactantius attained a significant reputation as a professor of rhetoric. This career had required great effort, as he put it, “to achieve what little skill I could in speaking.” He added, “but I have never been eloquent, because I never went into public life.”²⁴ He meant by this that he had never worked either as an advocate (trial lawyer) or as a jurist (legal adviser). We can surmise that he had given various public speeches, some requisite to his teaching and others in local civic service. At the imperial court he would have given official orations celebrating Diocletian. Here Lactantius would have first seen Constantine, a member of the distinguished audience and an apparent successor to the emperor.²⁵

Rhetoric played a crucial role not only in such ceremonies but also in the practice, maintenance, and codification of Roman Law. Apropos of these forensic aspects, Lactantius had spent years both as a student and a teacher in “the practice of pleading imaginary cases.”²⁶ The schools of his youth and of his early career in North Africa very probably resembled those roughly a century later in Carthage, attended, as Augustine would have us believe, by upper-class students devoted as much to the pursuit of pleasure as to the pursuit of education. Schools of rhetoric across the Roman Empire must to some extent have shared similar conditions. Perhaps the provincial town of Sicca Veneria (modern El Kef in Tunisia) lacked the range of distractions offered at Carthage.²⁷ Whatever his experience, nothing indicates that Lactantius suffered, either

religieuse de l'Antiquité à nos jours, Didier Boisson and Elisabeth Pinto-Mathieu, eds. (Rennes: P.U. Rennes, 2012), 61–78.

24 *Inst.* 3.13.12.

25 Barnes, *Constantine*, 176; see also 8–9.

26 *Inst.* 1.1.10. On L. and Roman Law, see Contardo Ferrini, “Su le idee giuridiche contenute nei libri v e vi delle Istitutioni de Lattanzio,” *Rivista internazionale di scienze sociali e discipline ausiliarie* 5 (1894): 581–86; and Jean Gaudemet, “Lactance et le droit romain,” in *Atti dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana, 2° Convegno Internazionale, 18–20 settembre 1975* (Perugia: Libreria Universitaria, 1976), 83–101. On rhetoric as intrinsic to Roman law, see Jill Harries, “Superfluous Verbiage? Rhetoric and Law in the Age of Constantine and Julian,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 19 (2011): 345–374; on rhetoric's importance for bureaucrats and jurists, see Ramsay MacMullen, “Roman Bureaucratism,” *Traditio* 18 (1962): 364–78, esp. 367–69; and Olga Tellegen-Couperus, “Roman Law and Rhetoric,” *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 84 (2001): 59–75; see also Ernest Metzger, “Roman Judges, Case Law, and Principles of Procedure,” *Law and History Review* 22 (2004): 243–75; and John Anthony Crook, *Legal Advocacy in the Roman World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995).

27 Ritual prostitution was once practiced in Sicca Veneria at the Temple of Astarte (Carthaginian goddess), which the Romans renamed the Temple of Venus (Val. Max. 2.6.15), but we have no information about the cult practices there in L.'s day. See Nicholson, “Arnobius and Lactantius,” 259–65.

as a student or as a teacher, a moral trauma like that of Augustine.²⁸ He did acknowledge that this education brought no special moral advantage. As a mature practitioner he reflected on “the profession of rhetoric in which we spent so long training young people not to be good but to be cleverly bad.”²⁹

These schools of rhetoric, the pinnacle of the Roman educational system, were not, as is often asserted, simply given over to empty speechifying on exotic topics contrived to keep young men entertained. As Martin Bloomer has shown, in arguing fictitious cases, upper-class youths practiced the role they would assume as adults, that of a Roman *paterfamilias*. Here young men trained to be the patrons of extended families and their clients. This schooled them in how to defend their own interests and in how to speak for the members of their own families, including the women and children. It also taught them how to speak for a family’s clients who belonged to other social classes – and even how to speak for a family’s slaves. Although these exercises trained the prospective *paterfamilias* how to adopt the voice of others, we cannot, of course, take his words as truly representative of their voices. But the youth did learn to speak for them in a way that other members of his class, gender, and station recognized as appropriate and compelling.³⁰ Lactantius himself understood that his years “of pleading imaginary cases” had given him a decided advantage. “I can now,” he said, “use my plentiful command of rhetoric to plead the cause of truth to its end.”³¹

More than any previous, perhaps any other ancient Christian author, Lactantius remained comfortable with classical literary culture. He appears incapable of believing that the two things he loved deeply were somehow antithetical.³² He knows that lack of eloquence in Christian writings has

28 Oliver Nicholson, “Doing what comes naturally: Lactantius and Libido,” *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997): 314–21. For Augustine, see *Conf.* 1.9–19; 3.1–5; and Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*, New edition with epilogue (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press, 2000) 35–45.

29 *Inst.* 1.1.8.

30 W. Martin Bloomer, “Schooling in *Persona*: Imagination and Subordination in Roman Education,” *Classical Antiquity* 16 (1997): 57–78; Henri I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), 265–329; Stanley F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome* (Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977); Nicole Fick, “L’image du professeur dans le roman latin,” in *Autour de Lactance*, 249–59; for the North African schools, see Brown, *Augustine*, 23–34 and 54–61.

31 *Inst.* 1.1.10.

32 See William Leadbetter, “Lactantius and *Paideia* in the Latin West,” in *Ancient History in a Modern University: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Macquarie University, 8–13 July, 1993*, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 1: 245–52.

repulsed the educated elites since “anything rough on the ears they assume is untrue, and nothing is credible unless it provides aesthetic pleasure.”³³ Lactantius chose to make his case directly to these elites, the very people who had engaged in open, amicable debate with Christians before the recent political and religious turmoil hardened the opposing positions.

When we consider Lactantius’s statements about philosophers, to some extent his reaction reflects the new cruel realities. In his *Institutes* he denounced two men, one a judge and the other a philosopher, for their writings against Christians and for their role in instigating the persecution.³⁴ The philosopher became the target of Lactantius’s invective (*Inst.* 5.2.3–11). Whoever he was, one suspects that Lactantius had him in mind when he elsewhere said of philosophers generally that “anyone investigating their behavior carefully will find them bad-tempered people, greedy, lustful, proud, shameless, and hiding their faults under a mask of wisdom while doing at home what they would have slated in school.”³⁵

Lactantius by this time had ceased to talk of “philosophers of our sect.” Indeed, he believed that Christians did not need a philosopher to make their case; what they needed was an advocate, a good defense lawyer.³⁶ He lamented not having the eloquence of Cicero to bring to his cause. He was confident, nevertheless, that he could win his case. After all, when the truth was on their side even mediocre lawyers won cases against the profession’s elite if these last were defending lies.³⁷ He elsewhere said that he would not “be doing anything notable in convicting the philosophers of ignorance” since they themselves repeatedly admitted it.³⁸ They ultimately lacked credibility in the very thing in which they ought to have been credible. All he had to do, he said, was “to show that they never spoke a truer word than in delivering the verdict on their own ignorance.”³⁹ Toward the end of book 3 Lactantius reiterated: “Philosophers admit themselves that they know nothing and aren’t wise: how can they carp at us for saying so too?”⁴⁰

33 *Inst.* 5.1.17.

34 No identification of this philosopher has proven convincing. Of the names proposed only Porphyry has current defenders; see here n. 75. L. identified the judge (*Epit.* 16.4) as Sossianus Hierocles. See Barnes, “Sossianus Hierocles,” 239–252.

35 *Inst.* 3.15.8.

36 *Inst.* 1.1.7; 3.1.5; and 3.13.12.

37 *Inst.* 3.1.4–5.

38 *Inst.* 3.1.15.

39 *Inst.* 3.1.16.

40 *Inst.* 3.28.10.

Lactantius seldom employed his own voice to prove philosophers wrong or to show that they failed to acquire the wisdom they sought. He much preferred to undermine their positions through a doxography of select quotation and omission and through adroit application of protreptic methods. The Sophists developed the protreptic method or genre. Its skillful use permitted a sophist to advance his own school by reviewing the deficiencies in the teaching of his rivals.⁴¹ Not surprisingly protreptic had found a secure place in the Second Sophistic. Lactantius's doxography and protreptic allowed him to parade the philosophers as witnesses against each other and even against themselves. Starting with Pythagoras – the first man to call himself a philosopher – Lactantius challenged philosophers' claims to wisdom (*sophia/sapientia*). Pythagoras had acknowledged that the word philosophy itself designated a quest for wisdom precisely because it did not possess wisdom.⁴² Throughout book 3 philosophers either refute each other or are shown to be self-contradictory. As Lactantius amusingly put it, he would let them speak "like typical academics." With the philosophers unable to discover the truth or to recognize it even when they found it, he then introduced his solution: "divine wisdom."⁴³ In this much, certainly, Lactantius observed well the intellectual currents of his day. He had in his corner what Garth Fowden has called "the unrepaired damage that skepticism had inflicted on classical philosophical rationalism." Fowden continues: "In a world where men's emotions were most profoundly stirred by revealed religions such as Christianity, or by pagan mysteries, the philosopher was obliged either to discover a compelling sanction for his doctrine, or else see his lecture-room emptied."⁴⁴ In book 4, "True Wisdom and Religion," Lactantius maintained that both pagan philosophy and pagan religion had gone astray because religion had been severed from wisdom and wisdom severed from religion. At several points he articulated his position that it was "one and the same God who should be both understood, which is the work of wisdom, and honored, which is the work of religion."⁴⁵ In combining religion and wisdom, he shared much common ground with pagan

41 See Mark D. Jordan, "Ancient Philosophical Protreptic and the Problem of Persuasive Genres," *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 4 (1986): 309–333.

42 *Inst.* 3.2.3.

43 *Inst.* 1.6.2; 1.1.11; and 3.26.10. For L's use of doxography and protreptic, see Wlosok, "Lactance," 438–39; and Casey, "Lactantius's Reaction," 218.

44 Garth Fowden, "Late Antique Paganism Reasoned and Revealed," *Journal of Roman Studies* 71 (1981): 178–82, quotation from 179; see Lact. *Inst.* 7.7.1–14 and Freund's commentary on this chapter, Laktanz, *Divinae institutiones, Buch 7: De vita beata*, intro., text, trans., and comm. Stefan Freund (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 2009), 314–24.

45 *Inst.* 4.4.2; 4.5.1; and 4.10.4.

philosophers of his day, who, like Lactantius, appealed to divine oracles or sacred texts to support their positions.

Lactantius's years of rhetorical schooling and educating had refined his perception of audience. He displayed a masterful touch in getting a laugh at the expense of his adversaries (or perhaps even in getting his opponents to laugh at themselves). Although he never personally argued a case in court – and certainly not this case – he, like his model advocate Cicero, knew the power of the imaginary exchange with his audience or his adversaries.⁴⁶ While exposing the inability of philosophers to discover truth, for instance, he drolly asked his audience, “Shall we wait until Socrates knows something, or Anaxagoras finds light in his darkness, or Democritus hauls up truth from its well, or Empedocles widens the paths of his mind, or Arcesilaus and Carneades can see, think and understand?”⁴⁷ He parodied the speculations of the natural philosophers, who argued positions that no one, as they themselves readily admitted, could ever produce evidence to verify or falsify. He introduced as his primary example those who speculated about the existence of antipodes beyond the unsurvivable torrid zone and the untraversable expanse of Ocean.⁴⁸ This ancient discussion about the existence of the antipodes resembles current ones about extraterrestrial intelligent life. Until someone produces evidence, all assertions are equally valid, though perhaps not all equally probable. Lactantius – unlike Augustine, who for theological reasons rejected the existence of the antipodes – exploited the natural philosophers and their wild, unfounded speculations about the antipodes for comic parody of a storied trait of philosophers. One suspects that many in his audience did laugh, even when they were open to speculation about the antipodes.

Among Lactantius's own contemporaries who were his auditors and readers, the most distinguished was the emperor Constantine himself. Lactantius is thought by some to have been in the West when he finished his *Institutes*. He is known to have joined Constantine's court as the tutor to his son Crispus. But scholars do not agree when this happened. Timothy Barnes argues that 311 to 312 are the most probable dates; Elizabeth Digeser contends that Constantine's

46 See Shane Butler, *The Hand of Cicero* (London-New York: Routledge, 2002), 35–84.

47 *Inst.* 3.30.6.

48 *Inst.* 3.24. Cf. *Inst.* 2.5.18–19 where L. admires the armillary sphere of Archimedes and uses it as evidence to argue against the Stoics. Cf. also *Inst.* 6.17.6, 7.15.15, 7.25.7, and *Epit.* 7.3, where L. uses various expressions regarding the ‘orbis terrae.’ But his use of ‘orbis’ in these passages is unclear.

Letter to Arles corroborates this general timeframe.⁴⁹ Though acknowledging the problem of who influenced whom, she thinks that, while in Trier, Lactantius would not only have instructed Crispus in Latin literature but was also reading his *Institutes* to Constantine and his court. Whatever circumstances then prevailed at the imperial court, scholars have long remarked on the similar views of Lactantius and Constantine. This is especially evident in Constantine's *Speech to the Assembly of the Saints*, which treats of philosophy and of the philosophers at some length.⁵⁰ Recent scholarship has now established that the speech was delivered in Nicomedia on 16 or 17 April, 325.⁵¹ This date, as far as we know, would have been very near or shortly after the death of Lactantius. The first section of the *Speech* (chapters 3–10) deals with philosophy and contains many references to Plato, even quoting him from time to time. Chapter 9 of the *Speech* deals generally with philosophers and specifically with Socrates, Pythagoras, and Plato, noting that they failed to find the truth and fell into many errors. These and other similarities between elements of the *Speech* and Lactantius's thought have long been recognized. Barnes now even speaks of Lactantius as Constantine's "intellectual mentor."⁵²

Latin Christians roughly a century later – Jerome, Augustine, Pelagius, Consentius, and others – knew Lactantius's work well. They would still have had available all or most of his *opera*. But only when these authors assist us with direct reference to now lost works of Lactantius can we reckon their debt

49 Barnes, *Constantine*, 177–78; Elizabeth DePalma Digeser, "Lactantius and Constantine's Letter to Arles: Dating the *Divine Institutes*," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2 (1994): 33–52; on verbal parallels 35–38; see also Eberhard Heck, "L'influence exercée par Constantine sur Lactance: sa théologie de la victoire," in *Lactance et son temps*, 55–74. Both Heck and Wlosok contend that L. remained in the Nicomedia throughout the persecutions: Eberhard Heck, "Constantine und Lactanz in Trier – Chronologisches," *Historia* 58 (2009): 118–30; and Wlosok, "Lactance," 429–30.

50 The *Speech* or *Oration* was originally in Latin. What survives is the official Greek translation appended to Eusebius's *Life of Constantine*. See Barnes, *Constantine*, 113–20 for a discussion of the *Speech*; Jeremy M. Schott, *Christianity, Empire, and the Making of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 110–35 for the *Speech*, and 112–22 for Lactantius; Mark Edwards, "The Constantinian Circle and the *Oration to the Saints*," in *Apologetics*, eds. Edwards et al., 251–75; Pichon, *Lactance*, 447–49; Marie-Louise Guillaumin, "L'exploitation des *Oracles Sibyllins* par Lactance et par le *Discours à l'Assemblée des Saints*," in *Lactance et son temps*, 185–202; and Daniel de Decker, "Le 'Discours à l'assemblée des Saints' attribué à Constantin et l'oeuvre de Lactance," in *Lactance et son temps*, 75–89. For L. and imperial imagery, see Nicholson, "*Caelum potius*."

51 See Barnes, *Constantine*, 117–18 for date and place.

52 Barnes, *Constantine*, 118; see also Bryce, "Lactantius' *De ave Phoenix*"; MacMullen, *Constantine*, 125–128, esp. 128; and Nicholson, "*Caelum potius*."

to these works. His influence must otherwise be ferreted from their use of his surviving works: *The Workmanship of God*, *The Wrath of God*, *Divine Institutes*, and the *Epitome*.⁵³ The extent to which fourth- or fifth-century authors relied on him for philosophical information is further obscured since they were products of an educational and cultural world nearly identical to that of Lactantius. They could have his work in mind or they may be referring to common sources. They all learned their philosophy primarily from Cicero.⁵⁴ St. Augustine, one of the greatest Latin thinkers of Antiquity, had little Greek and learned such Greek as he had late in life.⁵⁵

St. Jerome (ca.347–420) openly declared that he was conversant with Lactantius and refused to lay Lactantius aside simply because dubious theological views appeared in his writings. Jerome remarked that Lactantius was “a veritable torrent of Ciceronian eloquence” and that in reading the *Divine Institutes*, *The Workmanship of God*, and *The Wrath of God* one encountered “an epitome of Cicero’s dialogues.”⁵⁶ Peter Roots has elucidated Jerome’s ‘epitome’ comment and shown that Lactantius’s *Institutes* were largely conceived as a

53 See for example, Jacques Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l’Espagne wisigothique*, 2nd ed., rev. and corr., 3 vols. (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1983), 745–47, esp. 746; see also 665 where Fontaine speculates on a common source to explain Isidore’s repeated recourse to L. and Ambrose in the same passages; and 761 on the possibility that Isidore possessed some or all of L.’s books of letters.

54 See Harald Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and other Christian Writers*, Göteborgs Universiteta Årsskrift 64 (Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1958), 53–76, 93–96, 316–17, 338–77, esp. 348.

55 See Brown, *Augustine*, 24; 268–79 for Augustine’s having learned Greek only when he found himself being upstaged by Pelagius; and 467 for Consentius. Timothy D. Barnes, “Scholarship or Propaganda: Porphyry *Against the Christians* in its Historical Setting,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 39 (1994): 53–54, says that Augustine learned Greek “in the years after 400.”

56 Hier. *Ep.* 58.10: “Lactantius, quasi quidam fluuius eloquentiae Tullianae, utinam tam nostra adfirmare potuisset quam facile aliena destruxit!” Hier. *Ep.* 70.5: “Septem libros aduersus gentes Arnobius edidit, totidemque discipulus eius Lactantius, qui de ira quoque atque opificio dei duo uolumina condidit: quos si legere uolueris, dialogorum Ciceronis in eis ἐπιτομήν reperies.” All of Jerome’s *testimonia* are in Samuel Brandt and Georg Laubmann, *L. Caeli Firmiani Lactantii opera omnia*, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 19 and 27 (Prague: Tempsky and Freytag, 1893), 27/1: 154–165 (hereafter cited as CSEL). From these, in the late fifteenth century, Gianfrancesco Pico distilled the tag “the Christian Cicero”: *De studio humanae et diuinae philosophiae* 1.7: “Quis apud nos non uideat esse Ciceronem sed Christianum, hoc est aliquem qui eum ad lineam unguemque expresserit? Quis enim non aduertit Lactantium Firmianum aequasse ipsum et forte praecelluisse in eloquendo?”

retractatio of various sections of Cicero's works.⁵⁷ We also know of Jerome's familiarity with Lactantius through his one-line review of the *Institutes*, possibly the most succinct and perceptive book review ever penned: "Would that Lactantius, almost a torrent of Ciceronian eloquence, had as capably affirmed our teaching as he deftly annihilated that of the pagans."⁵⁸ In the eighty plus years that separated the *Institutes* from Jerome's comment, Christians had refined their dogmas and pagan opposition had attenuated. In consequence, Jerome's "deftly annihilated" phrase strongly endorsed the first three books of the *Institutes*, the attack on false religion and false wisdom. Jerome was decidedly less pleased with the last four books on "our teaching."

Scholars have recognized direct echoes of Lactantius in the writings of Jerome, but few relate to philosophy.⁵⁹ One philosophical echo is Jerome's reference to the passage in Lactantius regarding the Pythagorean "two ways" (*bivium*) as represented in the letter Y, a symbol of the possibilities for a life of vice or of virtue.⁶⁰ Another reflects a passage of the *Institutes* in which Lactantius spoke to people with "some attainment in literature," both pagans and Christians. These people were apt to waver because "philosophy, oratory, and poetry are all pernicious for the ease with which they ensnare incautious souls in beguiling prose and the nice modulation of poetical flow." Jerome redeployed this phrasing in explaining to Pope Damasus I the parable of the prodigal son, in particular his eating husks thrown to hogs (Luke 15: 11–32). According to Jerome, the husks represented "the songs of the poets [poetry],

57 Roots, "The *De opificio*," 466–67; and Roots, "De opificio Lactantii: A Reassessment of the Work of L. Caecilius Firmianus Lactantius," (Diss., Cambridge University, 1988). The correspondences according to Roots are: Lact. *Inst.* 1 and 2: Cic. *N.D.* 1 and 2; Lact. *Inst.* 3: Cic. *Acad.*; Lact. *Inst.* 5: Cic. *Rep.* esp. 3; Lact. *Inst.* 6: Cic. *Off.*; Lact. *Inst.* 7: Cic. *Consol.* (lost); Lact. *Opif.*; Cic. *Rep.* 4, *Leg.* 1, *N.D.* 2, *Tusc.* 1 and *Acad.*

58 Hier. *Ep.* 58.10: see here n. 56.

59 See the "Index locorum" of Heck and Wlosok in Lactantius, *Divinarum institutionum*, 763–801; Michel Perrin, "Jérôme lecteur de Lactance," in Yves-Marie Duval, ed., *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient: XVI^e centenaire du départ de saint Jérôme de Rome et de son installation à Bethléem. Actes du colloque de Chantilly, septembre 1986* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1988), 99–114; Neil Adkin, "Jerome as Centoist: *Epist.* 22.38.8," *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 28 (1992): 461–71; Adkin, "The Preamble to Book V of Lactantius's *Divine Institutes* and Jerome," *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 39 (2003): 101–108; Andrew Cain, "Tertullian, Cyprian, and Lactantius in Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians*," *Review d'études augustiniennes et patristiques* 55 (2009): 23–51, esp. 46–50; and Cain, "Three further Echoes of Lactantius in Jerome," *Philologus* 154 (2010): 88–96.

60 Lact. *Inst.* 6.3.6–18; Hier. *Comm. in Eccles.* 10.21.37–39. See also Theodor E. Mommsen, "Petrarch and the Story of the Choice of Hercules," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 16 (1953): 178–192, esp. 183–185.

the wisdom of the world [philosophy], the ostentatious speech of the rhetoricians [oratory],” which are nothing less than “the food of demons.” He went on to say that “these charm everyone because of their beguiling prose; they simultaneously capture the ears with flowing verses in nice modulation and engage our deepest emotions.”⁶¹

In the late 380s, Jerome again revealed his familiarity with the works of Lactantius. But for mysterious reasons Jerome fabricated correspondence (*Letters* 35 and 36) to present his own views as those of the late Pope Damasus I.⁶² In *Letter* 35, ‘Damasus’ commented that “I read without pleasure those books of Lactantius you gave to me a long time ago because most of his letters reach almost a thousand lines and rarely deal with Christian teaching.”⁶³ ‘Damasus’ referred to all or some part of Lactantius’s now lost collections of letters: four books to Probus, two books to Severus, and two books to Demetrianus.⁶⁴ In these last to Demetrianus, Jerome elsewhere indicated that Lactantius did discuss Christian teaching in them, at least insofar as he denied there the “subsistence of the Holy Spirit.” Jerome thought this mistake reflected Lactantius’s ineptitude in the interpretation of scripture.⁶⁵ In the end ‘Damasus’ observed

-
- 61 For the identification and an analysis of this echo (Lact. *Inst.* 5.1.9–10 and Hier. *Ep.* 21.13.4), see Adkin, “The Preamble,” 101–108.
- 62 See Pierre Nautin, “Le premier échange épistolaire entre Jérôme et Damase: lettres réelles ou fictives?” *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 30 (1984): 331–344.
- 63 Damasus (apud Hier. *Ep.* 35.2): “Fateor quippe tibi, eos quos mihi iam pridem Lactantii dederas libros, ideo non libenter lego quia et plurimae epistolae eius usque ad mille spatia uersuum tenduntur, et raro nostro dogmate disputant. . . .” Nothing here indicates which letters “Damasus” has in mind. Jerome, the author of the letter, knew of them all but perhaps only *knew* those to Demetrianus (see here also nn. 64 and 65).
- 64 We know of L.’s lost books of letters from Jerome’s statement (*Vir. ill.* 80): “Habemus eius . . . ad Probum epistolarum libros quatuor, ad Severum epistolarum libros duos, ad Demetrianum, auditorem suum, epistolarum libros duos, ad eundem de opificio dei uel formatione hominis librum unum.” For the probable identities of Probus (Petronius Probianus, Cons. 322), Severus (Acilius Severus, Cons. 323 and Prefect of Rome), and Demetrianus (holder of some unknown office), see Timothy Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 92, 102, 111; Barnes “Some Missing Names,” *Phoenix* 27 (1973): 135–55, esp. 149; MacMullen, *Constantine*, 129; Hagith Sivan, “Anician Women, the Cento of Proba, and Aristocratic Conversion in the Fourth Century,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1993): 140–57, esp. 150–52.
- 65 Hier. *Ep.* 83.7: “Lactantius in libris suis et maxime in epistulis ad Demetrianum spiritus sancti omnino negat substantiam et errore Iudaico dicit eum uel ad patrem referri uel filium et sanctificationem utriusque personae sub eius nomine demonstrari.” Hier. *Comm. in epist. Ad Galat.* 2.4: “. . . multi per imperitiam scripturarum, quod et Firmianus in octauo ad Demetrianum epistularum libro facit, adserunt spiritum sanctum saepe patrem, saepe

that “as a result, the drawn out reading not only produces boredom but also, if some letters are short, they are more suitable for professors of rhetoric (*scolastici*) than for us [a scholarly pope and a monk] because they discuss poetic meter, topography, and philosophy.”⁶⁶ Perhaps Jerome’s qualifier, “reading without pleasure,” is an official disclaimer lest he be seen to enjoy eating “the food of demons”; perhaps he meant it literally.⁶⁷ Whatever motivated Jerome to fabricate this correspondence, for our purposes it conveys his observations about the content of Lactantius’s letters: (1) they “rarely deal with Christian teaching,” (2) they are “more suitable for professors of rhetoric,” and (3) they dwell on matters of “poetic meter, topography, and philosophy.”⁶⁸

St. Augustine (354–430) also knew the works of Lactantius, but it is difficult to determine just how well. Unlike Jerome, Augustine did not labor under intense alienation from philosophy. Yet he relied on Lactantius openly and with approval only for quotations from the Sibyls. In *On True Religion* he followed Lactantius’s main theme from book 4 on the necessity of combining wisdom and religion, and in *On Christian Teaching* he cited him favorably as an example for ‘plundering the Egyptians.’⁶⁹ But when Augustine was sent

filius nominari.” Jerome clearly meant by *imperitia scripturarum* that L. did not know *how to interpret* Scripture. The phrase has misled some to believe that Jerome thought L. had read little Scripture. Jerome, however, would have easily recognized that L. alluded to Scripture and adapted it extensively in his writings, esp. the *Institutes* (see Monat, *Lactance et la Bible*).

- 66 Damasus (apud Hier. *Ep.* 35.2): “... quo fit ut et legenti fastidium genere longitudo et, si qua brevia sunt, scolasticis magis sint apta quam nobis, de metris et regionum situ et philosophia disputantia.” Nautin, “Le premier échange,” 333 n. 6 points out that Jerome never used *scolasticus* in a pejorative sense but rather to designate the educated and scholars. Since Jerome is making a distinction between *scolastici* and *nos* (that is, a scholarly pope and monk), I’ve translated *scolastici* as ‘professors of rhetoric.’
- 67 Later canon law made it almost cliché that bishops could read secular literature “for erudition” but “without pleasure.” Gratian, *Decretum* D.37, dict. post c.8: “Sed seculares litteras quidam legunt ad uoluptatem, poetarum figmentis et uerborum ornatu delectati; quidam uero ad eruditionem eas addiscunt, ut errores gentilium legendo detestentur, et utilia, que in eis inuenerint, ad usum sacrae eruditionis deuote inuertant. Tales laudabiliter seculares litteras addiscunt.”
- 68 Our direct knowledge of the content of L.’s letters all derives from a few fragments, but, limited as these are, they corroborate the summary of their content by ‘Damasus.’ These fragments are available with critical apparatus in Brandt and Laubmann, *CSEL*, 27, 157–158.
- 69 *Civ. dei* 18.23; *De Doct. Christ.* 2.40.61. See Peter Garnsey, “Lactantius and Augustine,” in *Representations of Empire: Rome and the Mediterranean World*, eds. Alan K. Bowman, Hannah M. Cotton, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price (Oxford: Oxford University Press,

Pelagius's *florilegia* from Scripture and catholic treatises that included quotations from Lactantius, he failed – ostensibly – to recognize their author. These quotations were, however, at some remove from Pelagius's original collection and were unidentified when Augustine saw them. He did contend that these quotations did not support Pelagius's position.⁷⁰ A fifteenth-century author, Antonio da Rho (on whom, more later), remarked in his *Apology* that he saw in reading Augustine that “while building his *City of God*, he does not blush to imitate Lactantius in many things.”⁷¹ Regrettably, Rho did not specify any of them. He doubtless knew both texts well. Later in life Rho reconsidered this view and rejected parallels between Lactantius and Augustine or, more precisely, asserted that Augustine was expressly refuting Lactantius at points. The only direct echo of Lactantius in Augustine, to my knowledge, is found in the latter's phrase “philosophy is the love and diligent pursuit of wisdom,” replacing Lactantius's *uel* with a *-que*. This sentence, with Augustine's slight variation, became a commonplace throughout the Middle Ages and well into the modern period.⁷²

Near the beginning of the sixth century, an anonymous Byzantine author compiled what is now commonly known as the *Tübingen Theosophy*. It survives in substantial fragments, with bits and pieces scattered in many manuscripts,

2002), 153–179; and Jacqueline Amat, “Des *Institutiones* aux *Confessiones*, de Lactance à Augustin: deux méthodes de conversion,” in *Hommages à Carl Deroux*, v, *Christianisme et Moyen Âge, Néo-latin et survivance de la latinité*, ed. Pol Defosse (Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 2003), 3–9. Amat concludes that beyond a few “connotations, stylistiques and thématiques” between L. and Augustine, one cannot be certain that Augustine had read the *Institutes*.

70 Augustine, *De nat. et grat.* 61.71 (referring to quotations from *Inst.* 4.24.12 and 4.25.8): “Ac per hoc et ea testimonia, quae non quidem de scripturis canonicis, sed de quibusdam catholicorum tractatorum opusculis posuit uolens occurrere his qui eum solum dicerent ista defendere, ita sunt media, ut neque contra nostram sententiam sint neque contra ipsius. Prima enim quae posuit, quia nomen eius qui ea dixit non ibi legi, siue quia ille non scripsit siue quia codex quem misistis id aliqua forte mendositate non habuit pertractare quid opus est? Maxime quoniam me in huiusmodi quorumlibet hominum scriptis liberum – quia solis canonicis debeo sine ulla recusatione consensus – nonnihil mouet quod de illius scriptis, cuius nomen non ibi inueni, ille posuit. . . .”

71 *Apol.* 15, in David Rutherford, *Early Renaissance Invective and the Controversies of Antonio da Rho*, Renaissance Text Series 19 (Tempe: MRTS, 2005): “Qui [Augustinus] tamen dum Ciuitatem dei molitur, Lactantium in multis non erubescit imitari. . . .”

72 *Lact. Epit.* 25.4: “. . . philosophia est amor uel studium sapientiae.” Aug. *De moribus* 1.21.38: “. . . siquidem philosophia est amor studiumque sapientiae. . . .” Boethius *In Isagogen* 1.3: “est enim philosophia amor et studium et amicitia quodammodo sapientiae. . . .”

which Harmut Erbse has collected and edited.⁷³ Pier Franco Beatrice has shown that what survives is the author's appendix to a lost work, *On True Belief*. The compiler included Lactantius's Hermetic and Sibylline quotations, but he also translated into Greek and paraphrased in Greek selections from Lactantius's *Institutes* to give the quotations a context. Beatrice convincingly argues that this compilation is not "some mysterious object" but rather "the ripe fruit" of the theosophical apologetic tradition. Lactantius was possibly the first to have developed such arguments in order to persuade pagan *literati*. Tellingly, the word 'theosophy' originated in the Neoplatonic tradition in which it had signified the combination of human philosophical wisdom with divinely revealed religious wisdom, this last meaning oracular utterances and texts. According to Eusebius of Caesarea, Porphyry of Tyre was especially fond of the term and used it to describe his *Philosophy from Oracles*.⁷⁴ The claim that Porphyry was the self-styled "high-priest of philosophers" whom Lactantius came to loath in Nicomedia in 303 has failed to convince,⁷⁵ but scholars generally agree

73 *Theosophorum graecorum fragmenta* (Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner, 1995). Translations based on the 1889 text of Karl Buresch can be found in Aloisius Rzach, rev. ed. Milton S. Terry, *The Sibylline Oracles* (1899, New York: AMS Press, 1973), 264–68; and James Moffatt, "Sibylline Oracles," in *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, ed. James Hastings with John Selbie, 2 vols. (New York: Scribners, 1918), II: 477–90, trans. II: 482. See also *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its Social Setting*, with intro., trans., and comm. by Rieuwerd Buitenwerf (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 85–86.

74 Pier Franco Beatrice, "Pagan Wisdom and Christian Theology according to the *Tübingen Theosophy*," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3 (1995): 403–18; 404 for information supplied by the eighth-century compiler. Beatrice suggests that the author, if not Severus of Antioch, was someone of that stamp. See also Oliver Nicholson, "Broadening the Roman Mind: Foreign Prophets in the Apologetic of Lactantius," *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001): 364–74, who sees L.'s quotations, classical as well as Sibylline, as not paying 'an intellectual debt' but as "an art, a performance art which played skillfully on the learning and predilections of his readers. Quotation can be almost symbolic"; and Stefan Freund, "Christian Use and Valuation of Theological Oracles: The Case of Lactantius's *Divine Institutes*," *Vigiliae Christianae* 60 (2006): 269–84, esp. 274, who argues that the role of the oracular quotations in the *Institutes* are "of very small importance" to L.'s overall purpose, but were a concession to his pagan audience. In no way, Freund asserts, do they derive from Porphyry's *Philosophy from Oracles*.

75 *Inst.* 5.2.3–11; *Inst.* 5.2.3 for the phrase: "...antistitem se philosophiae profitebatur..." See here at nn. 34 and 35. For evidence against the identification of this philosopher with Porphyry, see Joseph Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre, le philosophe néo-platonicien* (1913, Hildesheim: G. Olm, 1964), 112 n. 2; Timothy D. Barnes, "Porphyry Against the Christians: Date and Attribution of Fragments," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 24 (1973): 424–42, esp. 437–39; Barnes, "Scholarship or Propaganda," 53–65, esp. 58–9; see also Freund,

that Porphyry's *Against the Christians*, *Philosophy from Oracles*, and perhaps other works no longer extant were regarded as serious threats to Christianity. Constantine made the possession of *Against the Christians* a capital crime and ordered all copies of the work destroyed. Oracular utterances unquestionably influenced Diocletian's decision to issue his edict against Christians in 303.⁷⁶ Lactantius's Hermetic and Sibylline material resonated either with broad or with immediate cultural currents, perhaps both. The *Tübingen Theosophy* indicates that interest in this material lingered in some circles until the late fifth and early sixth century.

The *Tübingen Theosophy* is the only known instance in which portions of Lactantius were translated into or summarized in Greek.⁷⁷ The compiler also had access to material that we no longer possess since he quoted some Sibylline utterances at greater length than had Lactantius.⁷⁸ It is in this context that we confront the compiler's introductory statement that Lactantius was "a philosopher not lacking esteem." Given that the compiler's focus is on Hermetic and Sibylline material, such a statement can stand without further comment. The next statement, however, is puzzling because the compiler added that Lactantius had become "a priest of the aforementioned Capitol," that is, of the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter, the repository of the Sibylline books.⁷⁹ This does provoke comment, or more precisely, grave doubt. Lacking further startling

"Christian Use." Scholars favoring the identification are Pierre Benoît, "Un adversaire du christianisme au III^e siècle: Porphyre," *Revue Biblique* 54 (1947): 543–72; Elizabeth DePalma Digeser, "Lactantius, Porphyry, and the Debate over Religious Toleration," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 88 (1998): 129–46; Digeser, *Christian Empire*, 64–90; Schott, "Porphyry on Christians," 277–314.

76 On the banning of *Against the Christians*, see Barnes, *Constantine*, 110; Barnes "Scholarship or Propaganda," 53; and Schott, *Christianity*, 209 n. 65. On oracles and the beginning of the persecution, see Elizabeth DePalma Digeser, "An Oracle of Apollo at Daphne and the Great Persecution," *Classical Philology* 99 (2004): 57–77; and Digeser, "Lactantius, Eusebius, and Arnobius: Evidence for the Causes of the Great Persecution," *Studia Patristica* 39 (2006): 33–46; and Harold A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 143–47.

77 If we grant L's influence on Constantine, then the official Greek translation of Constantine's *Speech to the Saints* might also be considered some kind of reflection of L's views available in Greek (see here at n. 50).

78 Erbse xvii.

79 *Theos.* S.3.71–76 (Erbse 63–4). His statement on the Sibylline books in the library of "the aforementioned Capitol" comes ten lines earlier, *Theos.* S.2.61–67 (Erbse 63). Oliver Nicholson has pointed out to me that the author may have derived this idea from L's suggestion (*Inst.* 7.24.12) – dealing with Virgil's *Eclogue* iv – that Virgil had access to the Sibylline books of the Capitol.

evidence, we have to conclude that regarding these two statements our anonymous author got the first arguably right, the second decidedly wrong.

By the sixth century the educational infrastructure of the Roman world, and more particularly and relevantly, that of the Latin West had seriously eroded.⁸⁰ In his retreat at Vivarium ('The Fish-Farm,' both literally and figuratively), Cassiodorus Senator (ca. 485–ca. 585) wrote his *Institutes* to lay out a program for the proper study of divine literature. Following Augustine, he praised Lactantius for having "plundered the Egyptians." Cassiodorus expressed this in book 1 in which he treated the material to be "read by those who cannot proceed in philosophical texts." Cassiodorus, as a telling sign of the changed circumstances, meant by "philosophical texts" book 2 of his own *Institutes*. He recommended that those brothers who from simplicity (*simplicitas*) were unable to understand grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy (the subjects of book 2) should first read the Fathers: Cyprian, Lactantius, Victorinus, Optatus, Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and innumerable Greeks, none of whom neglected secular literature. Their example, he said, should be followed cautiously but without hesitation.⁸¹

In the course of the sixth century Lactantius fades further from sight. Theological debates were now largely settled that had once been open questions or vaguely defined. Lactantius's works could easily raise doubts in the aftermath of the Arian and Pelagian controversies and the rejection of literal interpretations of the Millennium. In this milieu open use of his work or citing him as an authority became increasingly rare. The *Decretum Gelasianum*, for instance, placed him among writers whose works were designated 'apocryphal.' The *Decretum* was ascribed variously to Pope Gelasius (492–96), to Pope Damasus (366–84), or to Pope Hormisdas (514–23). Its modern editor, Dobschütz, argues that it originated in sixth-century Italy, but that it is neither from Rome nor carries more than pseudepigraphal papal authority.⁸² The last section of the work supplied its usual title: *On Books to be Accepted and*

80 Pierre Riché, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: From the Sixth through the Eighth Centuries* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1976), 52–136.

81 Cassiod. *Inst.* 1.28.3–4.

82 Das "*Decretum Gelasianum: De libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*," text, ed., intro. Ernst von Dobschütz, *Text und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literature* 38, Heft 4 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche, 1912), 29 and 81. See also Vittorino Grassi, "Il *Decretum Gelasianum*: nota in margine all'autorità della chiesa di Roma alla fine del sec. v," *Augustinianum* 41 (2001): 231–55; and Rudolf Weigand, "Fälschungen als *Paleae* im Dekret Gratians," in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter. Teil 11. Gefälschte Rechtstexte—Der bestrafte Fälscher*. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* 33.2 (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1988), 301–18, esp. 307–08.

Rejected. Dobschütz points out that the *Decretum Gelasianum* broadly rejects the authority of the listed works and forbids their reading. But its use of *legere* is unclear: it may mean “all reading,” even private or just the “official reading” in the churches. Nor does the *Decretum* make clear whether ‘apocryphus’ means absolutely “heretical and condemned” or simply “extracanonical.”⁸³

Both the names on the *Decretum*’s list and their order are curious. Eusebius of Caesarea and Tertullian come just before the “Opuscula Lactantii, apocrypha.” Does *opuscula* (little works) refer to his collections of letters? to *The Wrath of God*? to *The Workmanship of God*? to the *Symposium*? to *The Deaths of the Persecutors*? Would that we knew. On the supposition that the *Institutes* would not be considered an *opusculum*, this prohibition must not have encompassed them. Whatever works were meant by *opuscula*, the list continues with the names of three obscure men followed by some celebrated heretics: Montanus, Prisca, Maximilla, and Mani. Next comes Commodian, Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian of Carthage, Arnobius, Tyconius (a Donatist), Cassian, and Victorinus of Pettau.⁸⁴ This diversity suggests that knowledge of Lactantius’s name on the list perhaps dampened curiosity, but one doubts that it figured decisively in his *fortuna*. In time the *Decretum* became an important checklist for medieval librarians looking to augment their collections. It circulated everywhere in one version or another. Its condemnation appears not to have resulted in the rejection of those authors who were otherwise appealing.⁸⁵

83 Dobschütz, “Untersuchung,” to *Das “Decretum Gelasianum”* 226; *Das “Decretum Gelasianum”* 11: “Cetera quae ab hereticis siue scismaticis conscripta uel praedicata sunt, nullatenus recipit catholica et apostolica Romana ecclesia; e quibus pauca, quae ad memoriam uenerunt et catholicis uitanda sunt, credidimus esse subdenda.” On the widespread reading and crucial role of apocryphal literature, see Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press, 1991), esp. 89–119.

84 See Dobschütz, “Untersuchung,” 247–332, and *Das “Decretum Gelasianum,”* 55–60, for the identities of the authors and works. The obscure “Africanus” he identifies as Sextus Julius Africanus, and “Postumianus and Gallus” he identifies as the interlocutors of the *Dialogues* of Sulpicius Severus.

85 See here n. 95; Joseph de Ghellinck, *Patristique et Moyen Âge: Études d’histoire littéraire et doctrinale*, Museum Lessianum – Section Historique 7 (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1947) 2: 255–58, who notes that many MSS suppress the names of Cyril and Theophilus from the list of *libri apocryphi*; and Conrad Leyser, “Late Antiquity in the Medieval West,” *A Companion to Late Antiquity*, ed. Philip Rousseau (Oxford: Blackwell, 2009), 29–42, esp. 32–33.

In the early seventh century, the encyclopedist Isidore of Seville (ca.560–636) readily excerpted Lactantius's works and relied on them extensively.⁸⁶ Isidore turned to Lactantius for definitions of philosophy and its divisions as well as for information about various philosophers and philosophical schools, including references to Hermetic texts and the Sibylline oracles. Isidore in some instances preferred the language and phrasing found in Lactantius even when he was aware of sources that would carry more weight, say Augustine or Cicero.⁸⁷ Yet Isidore only occasionally adopted Lactantius's interpretation or assessment of a particular philosopher or of an idea. This approach was by no means restricted to Lactantius. Whatever Isidore's source, his interpretation often differed, sometimes substantially, from the original. While borrowing heavily from Lactantius for specific information, vocabulary, or phraseology, Isidore freely integrated it with other material similarly treated. He then contextualized and interpreted all of it according to his own purposes.

It must also be noted that for all his pillaging of Lactantius, Isidore never once in his *Etymologiae* named him as a source.⁸⁸ As counter-intuitive as it might seem, this omission signals Lactantius's importance for Isidore. Reflecting on Isidore's citation method, Jacques Fontaine concluded that whenever Isidore neglected to name his source – always with Lactantius – he was probably quoting directly; whenever he named a source he was probably quoting indirectly. Such consistency could not result from simple oversight. According to Fontaine, Isidore deliberately presented the material as a new creation. In a very real sense it was new.⁸⁹ Every topic – as his title *Etymologiae*

86 All English translations are from *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, trans. Stephen A. Barney, W.J. Lewis, Jennifer A. Beach, and Oliver Berghof, with collab. of Muriel Hall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). Critical editions used: Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive Originum libri XX*, ed. Wallace M. Lindsay, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911); and *Etymologiae* (Books 2, 9, 12, 17, 19 published), eds. and trans. Peter Marshall, Marc Reydellet, and Jacques André, *Auteurs Latins du Moyen Age* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1981–1995).

87 See Fontaine, *Isidore*, 598–99, 722–23, 729–30, and 745–47; see also here n. 53. For a detailed commentary of *Origines* 8.11, which clearly demonstrates Isidore's method of borrowing, interlacing, and reinterpreting, see Katherine Nell Macfarlane, "Isidore of Seville on the Pagan Gods (*Origines* VIII.11)," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* n.s. 70.3 (1980): 1–40; and Cesare Magazzù, "L'influsso del *De opificio dei* di Lattanzio sul libro XI delle *Etymologiae* di Isidore," *Bollettino di studi latini* 12 (1982): 247–50. For Isidore's historical context, see also Consuelo Maria Aherne, "Late Visigothic Bishops, their Schools, and the Transmission of Culture," *Traditio* 22 (1966): 435–44.

88 Isidore does name L. three times in his *De differentiis rerum* 2.17, 2.21, and 2.29.

89 Fontaine, *Isidore*, 501, 613, 745–47 and 766–70.

sive origines indicates – he sought to analyze according to its etymology or origin. As Bernard Ribémont explains, for Isidore the knowledge of the origins of words allowed one to grasp the nature of things, all made coherent by God, the ultimate origin of everything. But tension remained between Isidore's desire to synthesize and his desire to compile, between his etymologic method and his inchoate *accessus ad auctoritates*.⁹⁰ Isidore's success in achieving both desiderata accounts for the enormous influence of his work in the following centuries. For however many manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* were ever made, roughly 1,000 survive to the current day.⁹¹

The passage in which Isidore explains philosophy (*Etymologiae* 2.24.1–2) demonstrates his method, the extent of his borrowing, and his new creation. In the following quotation, the quotation marks and the information inserted with square brackets are mine; likewise the italicization of the words duplicated from Lactantius, *Institutes* 3.3.1–4.

Philosophia est 'rerum humanarum diuinarumque' cognitio [Cic. *De or.* 1.212] cum studio 'bene uiuendi' coniuncta [Cic. *Tusc.* 1.95]. Haec *duabus ex rebus constare uidetur, scientia et opinione*. 'Scientia est cum res aliqua certa ratione percipitur' [Aug. *De quant.* 26.52]; *opinio* adhuc *incerta* res latet et 'nulla ratione firma' uidetur [Aug. *De quant.* 26.52], utputa *sol utrumne tantus quantus uidetur an maior sit quam omnis terra, item luna globosa sit an concaua [...] quanta sit terrae crassitudo aut quibus fundamentis librata et suspensa permaneat*.

Isidore named no sources, so this simply read (as translated):

Philosophy is the understanding of human and divine things joined with the pursuit of living well. It seems to consist of two things: knowledge and opinion. Knowledge obtains when some thing is perceived by sure reasoning; opinion, however, when an unsure thing still lies concealed

90 Bernard Ribémont, *Le origines des encyclopédies médiévales: d'Isidore de Séville aux Carolingiens* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2001), esp. 51–58 for the implications of his etymologic method; 189 for God and the relation between *res* and *verba*; 92 for the method and *accessus*.

91 See August Eduard Anspach, "Das Fortleben Isidors in VII. bis IX. Jahrhundert," *Miscellanea Isidoriana* (Rome: Gregoriana, 1936), 323–56; Jose Maria Fernandez Caton, *Las Etimologías en la tradición manuscrita medieval estudiada por el Prof. D. Anspach* (Leon: Centro de Estudios e Investigacion 'San Isidoro', 1966); and Aherne, "Late Visigothic Bishops," 440.

and is grasped by no solid reasoning – for instance whether the sun is as large as it seems to be or is larger than the whole earth, or whether the moon is spherical or concave or how thick the earth is, or on what foundation it endures balanced and suspended. (Trans. Barney, Lewis, Beach, Berghof)

Virtually no one in Isidore's day, or for many centuries thereafter, had the ability to establish a *Quellenforschung* for the *Etymologiae* generally or for this passage. Nor in most instances would even the best scholars have been aware that Isidore's exposition often contradicted his source. Lactantius had made the point, for instance, that philosophers could never achieve *scientia* but were hopelessly stuck in *opinio*. *Scientia* proper belonged to God. No middle ground existed between *scientia* and *opinio*. Isidore, on the contrary, made the point that philosophers could achieve *scientia*, on several levels and in varying degrees. Clearly, by Isidore's day the "damage that skepticism had inflicted on classical philosophical rationalism" had been repaired.⁹²

Whatever conclusion one draws about Lactantius's influence on medieval philosophy *via* Isidore – a complicated issue in the annals of cultural transmission to be sure – Lactantius's name was seldom associated with the ideas discussed. One exception is Isidore's statement on the Sibyls. This circulated as an independent extract, usually without attribution to Isidore but often with some mention of Varro and Lactantius.⁹³ Some manuscripts ascribe it directly to Lactantius, who is in fact Isidore's main source. Lactantius's name may have been widely associated with the Sibyls, since in the *City of God* (18.23) Augustine reproduced the Latin translations of the Sibylline lines found in Lactantius's *Institutes* and *Wrath of God*, naming him as the source.

Using as our evidence the existing manuscripts of Lactantius and their stemmata, we can be certain of the survival at the opening of the ninth century

92 On this passage, see Fontaine, *Isidore*, 607–09. For the quotation from Fowden, see here n. 44.

93 Isidore, Etym. 8.8. I have not searched for MSS of these *excerpta* specifically, but whenever possible (since some are found in MSS of L's works) they were included in my research. The earliest I have examined is a tenth-century MS: Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS Voss. lat. Q 69, ff. 1r–3v. Most are from the twelfth and thirteenth century: Douai, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 219, saec. XII, fols. 165v–166r; Metz, Bibliothèque Médiathèque de la Ville, MS 1212, saec. XII, fols. 181r–184v; London, British Library, MS Royal lat. 15.A.XXII, saec. XII, fols. 110r–114v; London, British Library, MS Royal lat. 15.B.XI, saec. XIII, fols. 67r–69v; Dublin, Trinity College Library, MS 514, saec. XIII/XIV, fols. 89v–92v; Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS 59, saec. XIII/XIV, fols. 56r–57r; Siena, Biblioteca Comunale Com., MS F.11.13, saec. XIV, fols. 33r–36r.

of only a few manuscripts of his works. Six of these manuscripts included the *Institutes*, four included *The Workmanship of God*, three included a substantial fragment of the *Epitome*, and two included *The Wrath of God*. Single complete copies of *The Deaths of the Persecutors* and *Epitome* survived but these ceased to circulate until the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries respectively. It appears that all copies of Lactantius's *Letters* had now perished. In the course of the ninth century, the *Institutes* were copied seven times, *The Workmanship* twice, *The Wrath of God* once, the fragment of the *Epitome* once, and *On the Deaths* once. But the disruptive events of the tenth century stalled production and almost certainly destroyed a number of manuscripts. Even though in the eleventh century two more copies of the *Institutes* were made, three also fall from sight during this same period. Similar fates befell Lactantius's other works. But in the twelfth century the tempo of manuscript production resumed, and by the end of the century the addition of six copies of the *Institutes* brought the total number of manuscripts containing this work to fourteen. We cannot say that all of these were actively read, some surely for reasons of paleographic difficulty. During the twelfth century, copies of book 3, "False Wisdom," and book 6, "True Worship," as well as two *florilegia* of varying lengths were also made. These last are the earliest surviving *florilegia* of his work.⁹⁴ It is possible that the *testimonia* of Jerome and Augustine were also introduced as prefatory material to Lactantius's works in this century, but our earliest surviving examples date to the fourteenth century. The preponderance of both ninth- and twelfth-century manuscripts were produced in northern France, the Low Countries, and the Rhine Valley.

This multiplication of manuscripts accompanied a growing awareness of Lactantius's work, or at least some awareness of his life and work, which we find among the scholastics. In most instances this acquaintance was limited to indirect references, as seen with Peter Abelard (1079–1142), who reproduced Lactantius's quotations of the Sibyls.⁹⁵ All of this, as Abelard acknowledged,

94 See above n. 53 for Fontaine's conjecture about a common source (an early *florilegia*?) for Lactantius and Ambrose. L's Book 3: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS CLM 14619, saec. XII, 1+84+1 ff.; L's Book 6: Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, MS R 436, saec. XI³–XII¹, 1+147+1 ff. The *florilegia* of L. are: Metz, Bibliothèque-Médiathèque de la Ville, MS 1212, saec. XII, fols. 219r–222r; and Bernkastel-Kues, Bibliothek des St. Nikolaus-Hospitals, MS 52 (C 14), saec. XII, fols. 264v–265v. This last is a copy of a *florilegia* made by Sedulius Scottus (fl. 840–60), who also excerpted the Greek quotations and translated them into Latin: Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS Grec. 8407, saec. IX, fols. 64v–66r. For these quotations and translations, see Heck and Wlosok, 737–62.

95 Abael. *Ep.* 7 and *Intr. ad. theol.* 1.21. Abelard does not cite L. in his *Sic et Non*. One might suppose this results from Abelard's refusal to cite apocryphal authors as indicated in

was derived from Augustine's *City of God* (18.23). Abelard's younger contemporary, Berengar of Poitiers, cited Lactantius as an example of someone whom Augustine admired for having 'left Egypt loaded with gold,' which he employed in thundering against the pagans. Even so, he said, Lactantius was afterwards known to have wildly concocted "certain things discordant with the church's teachings."⁹⁶ Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274) mentioned Lactantius on only four occasions, but his misrepresentation of Lactantius's view of the Judgment strongly suggests that Aquinas drew his information from some indirect source.⁹⁷

The first extensive, open, and direct use of Lactantius in medieval philosophical writing came only in the mid-thirteenth century with Gilbert of Tournai's *Rudimentum doctrinae* (1259–62).⁹⁸ Gilbert, a Parisian Franciscan

the *Decretum Gelasium* (see here nn. 82 and 85), which Abelard affixes to his work. But Abelard's manuscript of the *Decretum* omitted L. from the list of apocryphal writers.

- 96 Berengar Pict. *Apol. contra Bernardum*: "Lactantius, de quo ipse Augustinus asseuerat quod multo auro suffarcinatus exierit de Aegypto cum ore fulmineo contra gentes Christum defendat, quaedam absona de dogmatibus ecclesiae postea somniat." Although not a scholastic, Abbot Wibald of Corvey (*Ep.* 147 in PL 189) in 1149 listed L. along with Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Leo the Great, "et alii quamplures praecipui et clari uiri, ingenio facili, copioso, suauis, et quae sermonis maxima est uirtus, aperto, ut discernere nequeas utrumne ornatiores in eloquendo, an feliciores in explicando, an potentiores in persuadendo fuerint." He goes on to point out mistakes made by each of them.
- 97 Aquin. *Comp. theol. ad frat. Raynaldum* 1.244; *Sup. Evang. S. Matt.* 17–20, lect. 2, cap. 3; 21–25, lect. 3; *In Psal.* 2.10; *Sup. epist. Pauli ad Hebr.* 6.1. These all take L. to have argued that the Judgment would require a thousand years to hear every person's case. Ps.-Aquinas, *Expos. in Boethii de schol. disc.* 6, misattributed to William Wheatley, did cite L. twice in his commentary on Boethius, but this looks to be a fifteenth-century work. In my view, the way L. is cited (*Inst.*, book 3, on philosophy and the philosophers) would support a late dating of this work. See Peter King, "Boethius: The First of the Scholastics," *Carmina Philosophiae* 16/17 (2007–08): 20.
- 98 Servus Gieben, O.F.M.Cap., "Four Chapters on Philosophical Errors from the *Rudimentum doctrinae* of Gilbert of Tournai, O.Min. (died 1284)," *Vivarium* 1 (1963): 141; 148–164 for the text and notes of the 'four chapters.' Gieben has now edited the table of contents to the *Rudimentum*: "Il 'Rudimentum doctrinae' di Gilberto di Tournai con l'edizione del suo 'Registrum' o tavola della materia," in *Bonaventuriana: Miscellanea in onore di Jacques Guy Bougerol, ofm*, ed. F. de Asís Chavero Blanco, 2 vols. (Rome: Edizioni Antonianum, 1988), 11: 621–80. My quotations are from Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, MS Plut. 36 dext. 6, saec. XIV, 238 ff. (digital access online) except when I come to the four chapters edited by Gieben, which cover ff. 20r–26r of this ms. For an extensive bibliography, see "Guibertus Tornacensis" on the Franciscan website: <http://users.bart.nl/~roestb/franciscan/franautg.htm>.

master, participated in St. Louis's first crusade and is perhaps best known for his treatise dedicated to St. Louis on *The Education of Kings and Princes*.⁹⁹ He held the Franciscan chair of theology at Paris following St. Bonaventure's election as Minister General. In 1963 Servus Gieben edited four chapters of the *Rudimentum*, which he fairly describes as "a large encyclopaedical work" with the errors of philosophers "embedded in a wide vision and a detailed exposition of the final cause of knowing."¹⁰⁰ Gieben adds that Gilbert, though not a speculative philosopher, was a competent theologian who enjoyed "a notable humanistic formation" and in doctrinal matters "relied upon authorities."¹⁰¹

After glimpsing 'Isidore in his Study,' we are perhaps less shocked than Gieben, who remarked that "the modern student has some difficulty in forgiving Gilbert when he catches him summarizing for several chapters an unexpected author, [Lactantius,] without citing his source."¹⁰² But Gilbert, unlike Isidore, did make direct reference to Lactantius, the first at the very opening of his work (Pt. I, ch. 1). He began by devoting two sentences to the "human condition" in which he observed that humans were originally "created for wisdom and happiness" but that even in their fallen state they still "aspire to knowledge and happiness." He continued: "Lactantius agreed: 'I cast no slur on their desire to know the truth, since man's great greed to acquire it is the doing of God; what I object to, after all that fine and excellent intention of theirs, is the utter lack of product due to their complete ignorance of what truth is, and of how, where, and in what frame of mind to seek it.'"¹⁰³ One page later Gilbert wove into his text, without identification, the opening sentence of the *Institutes*: "In the days

99 Jacques Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, trans. Gareth E. Gollrad (Notre Dame IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), 321–28; and Lester K. Little, "Saint Louis' Involvement with the Friars," *Church History* 33 (1964): 125–48, esp. 134.

100 Gieben, "Four Chapters," 142. Gilbert explained the layout of his *Rudimentum* (1r) Tractatus iste, qui dicitur Rudimentum doctrine uel erudimentum, quatuor habet partes de doctrina exequentes. Prima est de causa finale doctrina. . . (2v) Secunda pars principalis huius tractatus est de causa efficiente et pertinet ad conditionem doctoris. . . (11r) Tercia pars principalis huius tractatus in quo agitur de causa formali, id est, modo discendi et docendi. . . (14r) Quarta pars principalis huius tractatus agit de causa materiali. . .

101 Gieben, "Four Chapters," 144–45.

102 Gieben, "Four Chapters," 145.

103 *Inst.* 3.1.7; Guib. *Rudim.* 15v: "Ex hoc satis indicatur quod ex prima creatione seu conditione homo creatus sit ad sapientiam et laetitiam quod in vallem tenebrarum proiectus et miseriae naturali motu cordis ad scientiam aspirat atque laetitiam. Propter quod Lactantius ait [*Inst.* 3.1.7]: Non ego reprehendo studium eorum // aut qua mente quaerendum. Culpe uero corruptioni qui considerant, legant, quoniam omnes homines naturaliter scire desiderant." For full text of the quotation from L., see here at n. 1.

when men of outstanding ability made a serious commitment to learning, they dropped every activity both public and private and devoted all the effort they could spend on it to the search for truth. They thought it far more glorious to investigate and understand the essence of things human and divine than to concentrate on piling up wealth and accumulating honors" (*Inst.* 1.1.1).

For the next four folios of the manuscript in the Biblioteca Laurenziana that I consulted (see n. 98 above), at least fifty percent of Gilbert's text is some form of direct quotation from Lactantius, mostly from *Institutes* book 3, "False Wisdom," that is, the book focused on philosophy and the philosophers. In these four folios Gilbert twice more named Lactantius. In the first instance he broke off plundering substantial portions of book 3.2, in which he did not indicate his source, in order to introduce lines from book 3.15.2–3 with an *ut ait Lactantius*. The other instance came when he wrapped up his extensive pillaging of book 3.15 with an *ut dicit Lactantius*. He then cribbed further from book 3.4 and 3.3. After a little stopover in book 3.13.5, he resumed the plundering of book 3.15. He next took snippets from book 4.2.2 and 4.2.4 before dragging in substantial sections of book 3.18 and 3.21. Again he gathered a few flowers from 3.22.9–10, 3.23.1, and 3.23.4 before taking an extended tour through most of book 3.17.

This brings us to the four chapters of the *Rudimentum* edited by Gieben (seven folios in the Laurenziana manuscript). Gilbert opened his discussion of philosophical errors of the "Physicists" by quoting, without acknowledgment, Lactantius's criticism of philosophers whose body of knowledge is lacking a head – God – to give it meaning (*Inst.* 6.9.13–15). He then noted Aristotle's mistake of thinking God's providence did not apply to the *inferiora*. Quotations, first from Ambrose and then from Lactantius (*Inst.* 1.5.22) – each acknowledged – refute Aristotle's position. Two folios later, working on philosophical errors in "mathematics but especially in astronomy," Gilbert quoted (unacknowledged) from the Hermetic lines of *Institutes* 2.15.6–8 and the Sibylline lines of 2.16.1. In both he followed the ninth-century translations of Sedulius Scottus. But when Gilbert came to the philosophical errors of the "Ethicists," for the next two full folios eighty to ninety percent of his material is plagiarized from Lactantius. Here we find small amounts from 3.7, but extensive appropriation of *Institutes* 3.8, 3.9, 3.11, and some use of 3.10.

One is tempted to say that Gilbert cribbed from Lactantius in every circumstance that Lactantius wrote something relevant to his topic. Gilbert has ostensibly quoted Virgil, Cicero, Lucretius, Democritus, Hermetic, and Sibylline lines, but all were taken from Lactantius with no hint of provenance. Within all of this material Gilbert only introduced four short quotations with a straightforward 'Lactantius says.' Gilbert's matter-of-fact tone in quoting

Lactantius further suggests wider recognition of his work. Gilbert's contemporaries could have encountered Lactantius's name in several circumstances: mostly in Augustine's Sibylline passage, in the *excerpta* from Isidore on the Sibyls or on the Pythagorean Y, or in some monastic library's *armaria*, which, in time, the Renaissance humanists would libel as 'foul dungeons'.¹⁰⁴ As regards this latter possibility, Gilbert's toponym, Tournai, points to his origins in the heartland of the Carolingian and Twelfth-Century Renaissance where most of the ninth- and twelfth-century manuscripts of Lactantius were produced. The manuscript that Gilbert used, which contained the translations of Sedulius Scottus, further suggests that Gilbert's origins in some way explain his familiarity with Lactantius.

Further comment is required about the sections of Gilbert's work in which some form of quotation of Lactantius constitutes fifty percent of Gilbert's text for approximately four full folios and eighty to ninety percent for two full folios. In some instances these quotations are verbatim, with variations from the *textus receptus* consistent with the probable readings in his own manuscript. In other instances it is paraphrase and summary. Sometimes the text is modified in a variety of ways, including heavy and repeated ellipsis augmented by the insertion of necessary phrasing to maintain coherent grammar and thought. Other times it substitutes synonyms for the original words. Often it combines these techniques with a steady intervention in the syntax.¹⁰⁵ Here one can find the text somewhat jarring – actually quite amusing. If you ever wondered what Lactantius would have sounded like had he been a medieval scholastic, Gilbert is your man! As extruded through the scholastic mind, Lactantius systematically breaks his points down into *prima, secunda, tertia*, and *quarta opinio*. He then proceeds to analyze them in a Latin resonant, I'm sure, of beautiful medieval French. Enchanting. Curiously, the single greatest distortion of Lactantius's thought encountered is that, as with Isidore, Gilbert's

104 Phyllis Gordon, trans. and notes, *Two Renaissance Book Hunters: The Letters of Poggius Bracciolini to Nicolaus de Niccolis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 195.

105 Since Gieben fails to indicate exactly what portions of Gilbert's text is derivative, I give this example (Gieben, 156 [f. 25v]) which adapts *Inst.* 3.9.1–6 (italics Lactantius): "Hoc est ergo verae sapientiae summum bonum, cuius hoc dicimus esse proprium: prius, *ut solius hominis sit et non alterius animalis*; secundo, *ut solius animae* [L. = *animi*] sit bonum, non corporis; tertio, *ut non possit alicui provenire sine scientia et virtute*. Dicamus autem nunc, quid omnes philosophos insipientes fecit et caecos. Anaxagoras, cum ab eo quaeretur cuius rei causa natus esset respondit: *caeli ac solis videndi*. Hanc vocem sicut dignam philosopho venerantur, quae magis secundum veritatem stulta et insipiens approbatur. Qui omne officium hominis in solis posuit oculis, ad corpus omnia referens, nihil ad habitum mentis, nonne iste si caecus fuisset, secundum ipsum, officium hominis amisisset? . . ."

Lactantius esteemed philosophy in a way that Lactantius himself had worked to undermine.

In the second half of the fourteenth century, Lactantius's name started to appear with increasing frequency, and manuscripts of his works began to multiply rapidly.¹⁰⁶ Admiration for Lactantius at this time swelled. This growing enthusiasm is clearly visible in the writings of Francesco Petrarca (1304–74) and Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–75). Petrarca, for instance, introduced him with a variety of adulatory expressions: “a man famed for his knowledge of poets and philosophers, for his Ciceronian eloquence, and for his Catholic faith” and “a man of great learning and eloquence.”¹⁰⁷ Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406) referred to him as “a man with Ciceronian eloquence and very learned in secular literature.”¹⁰⁸ In his *Life of Petrarca* Leonardo Bruni (1370–1444) reported with approval that Petrarca's father had sent him away to study law, but Petrarca “secretly . . . directed all his study to Cicero, to Vergil and Seneca, to Lactantius and to other philosophers, poets and historians.”¹⁰⁹ In his letter to Battista Malatesta (*De studiis et litteris*), Bruni admired the theology of Lactantius, Augustine, and Jerome (in that order), which was “of a legitimate and liberal kind,” unlike the “confused and vulgar sort” of his own contemporaries.¹¹⁰ Bruni went on to say that “the greatest of all those who have ever written of the Christian religion, the one who excels them all with his brilliance and richness of expression, is Lactantius Firmianus, without doubt the most eloquent

106 I've located at least 20 mss of the *Institutes* alone produced in the fourteenth century, most in the latter half, and another 12 that are dateable to the late fourteenth or to the early fifteenth centuries. The sixth-century commentary on Statius's *Thebais* by Lactantius Placidus began to recirculate in the late fourteenth century as a work of Firmianus Lactantius. Two poems were also mistakenly ascribed to L. at this time: one anonymous and the other by Venantius Fortunatus.

107 Petrarca, *De otio religioso* (Rotondi 22–33, 84–89, 104); Petrarca, *Rerum memorandarum libri*, ed. Giuseppe Billanovich (Florence: Sansoni, 1943) 14, 16, 210–14, 246, 249.

108 *De fato* 3.13.

109 *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni: Selected Texts*, trans. and intro. Gordon Griffiths, James Hankins, and David Thompson, (Binghamton: MRTS, 1987), 96; Italian text of the *Life* in Leonardo Bruni Aretino, *Humanistisch-Philosophische Schriften*, ed. Hans Baron (Leipzig: Teubner, 1928) 64: “Apparate le lettere, e uscito di quelli primi studii puerili, per comandamento del padre si diede allo studio di ragione civile e perseverovvi alcun' anno. Ma la natura sua, la quale a più alte cose era tirata, poco stimando le leggi e i litigi e reputando quella essere troppo bassa materia a suo ingegno, nascosamente ogni suo studio a Tullio, a Virgilio ed a Seneca ed a Lattanzio ed a gli altri filosofi e poeti e storici riferiva [reservava?].”

110 Translations and citations are from *Humanist Educational Treatises*, ed. and trans. Craig W. Kallendorf, I Tatti Library (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

of all Christian authors . . ." (*Battista* 7). Bruni later named the "ancients whose memory we venerate: Plato, Democritus, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Varro, Cicero, Seneca, Augustine, Jerome, [and] Lactantius, with all of whom we can scarce decide whether it is their knowledge or their literary power that is the greater" (*Battista* 29). Examples could be multiplied, but as these illustrate, late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century humanists readily admired Lactantius's eloquence and considered him a theologian, which clearly implied philosophical learning. Perhaps the most telling development was the list of philosophers and theologians that Lactantius now joined.

The escalation in reading and use of Lactantius at this time was not restricted to the humanists. A number of readers well outside humanistic circles were familiar with the work of Lactantius. One of the most eminent was the theologian and chancellor of the University of Paris, Jean Gerson (1363–1429). In describing the reading requisite for speculative and mystical theology, Gerson especially valued Augustine, Orosius, Jerome, Lactantius, and Cassiodorus because of their knowledge of pagan literature.¹¹¹ He also introduced statements from Lactantius in order to explain the views of the Stoics and Peripatetics, clearly regarding Lactantius as an authority on the topic.¹¹² Gerson quoted and named Lactantius in his Latin orations and sermons, and even did so in a vernacular sermon.¹¹³ In explaining the duties of a bishop, Gerson recommended authors and books that he thought "pertained to prelates." After listing three works by Gregory – *Lives of the Fathers*, *Dialogues*, and *Rule for Pastors* – he then named the *Divine Institutes* of Lactantius. The list continues with the Gospels of Luke and John, Paul's Epistles; Gratian's *Decretum*, a confessional manual, a *Life of Christ*, and St. Thomas's *Summa on vices and virtues*.¹¹⁴ What company!

111 Jean Gerson, *Œuvres complètes*, intro., text, and notes Palémon Glorieux, 10 vols. (Paris: Desclée & Cie, 1960–73): Gerson, *Œuvres épistolaire* 5, Glorieux II: 34. See Daniel Hobbins, *Authorship and Publicity before Print: Jean Gerson and the Transformation of Late Medieval Learning* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), esp. 32–33; Gilbert Ouy, "Discovering Gerson the Humanist: Fifty Years of Serendipity," in *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. Brian Patrick McGuire. (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 79–132; and Brian Patrick McGuire, *Jean Gerson and the Last Medieval Reformation* (University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005).

112 Gerson, *Œuvre magistrale* 99, Glorieux III: 238; Glorieux III: 241; Gerson, *Œuvre ecclésiologique* 271, Glorieux VI: 127.

113 Gerson, *Œuvre oratoire* 238 and 251, Glorieux v: 438 and 592; Gerson, *Œuvre française* 347, Glorieux VII.2: 593.

114 Gerson, *Œuvre épistolaire* 29, Glorieux II: 112.

In the midst of this expanding adulation and admiration we find a few cautionary voices: some timeworn, others recent. Various *testimonia*, especially of Jerome and Augustine, were now often included in Lactantius manuscripts as prefatory material, warning the readers to exercise caution.¹¹⁵ None of the *testimonia* from Augustine were written about Lactantius. One would not know that, however, from their appearance in the manuscripts of Lactantius' *opera* as an introductory warning "About these books . . ." (*de his libris*). From at least the thirteenth century, various marginalia in the manuscripts also alerted readers to dubious ideas or theological errors. Even Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439), whose enthusiasm for Lactantius was especially strong,¹¹⁶ warned Santio Ballo that the works of Lactantius contained things incongruous with Christian teaching. We learn of this because Santio wrote to Traversari asking for specifics about these dangers in Lactantius. A bewildered Santio could only see things "perfectly consistent with our religion."¹¹⁷

in 1444, trying to dispel such Fog, Antonio da Rho, the Milanese Franciscan and sometime court orator for Duke Filippo Maria Visconti, dedicated his *Three Dialogues against Lactantius* to Pope Eugenius IV.¹¹⁸ These *Dialogues* are

115 For the *testimonia* of Jerome, see here n. 56. One *testimonium* from Augustine is Civ. dei 20.28.5: "Nullus uel negat uel dubitat // a me commemorata sunt ordine esse uentura." Another is a compilation from Aug. Contra Faust. 11.5 and Ep. 2.82.5: "De his libris dici potest // non licet dubitare quod uerum sit. Alios ita lego ut quantalibet sanctitate // fidei tenore ueritatis astipulatur." The last is from Aug. Ep. 3.143.2–3: "Nimis peruerse se ipsum amat // que cognouerit dicenda non fuisse."

116 Gabriella Pomaro, "Fila traversariane: I codici di Lattanzio," in Giancarlo Garfagnini, ed., *Ambrogio Traversari nel VI centenario della nascita: Convegno internazionale di studi, Camaldoli – Firenze, 15–18 settembre 1986* (Florence: Olschki, 1988), 235–85.

117 Xanthus Ballus Panormitanus ad A. Trauersarium (*Latine epistole* 2: 1019–1020): "Reuerso iam Pisas mihi Lactantii Firmiani eloquentissimi uiri opuscula duo primum offeruntur, *De Dei opificio et ira*, quae librarius quidam nuper absoluerat. Illos ego non emendo solum; uerum, quia a te monitus sum satis his in libris a fide diuiasse, adcuratissime lectito, minutimque omnia pondero. Nihil mihi emendandum Firmianum dixisse uisum est: nihil non Christianissimum inueni: omnia religioni nostrae consentanea mihi uisa sunt. Ea causa maxime uereor ne male cum Lactantio sentiam: neue incautus in fide peccem uehementer timeo. Quamobrem te enixissime obsecro, qua in re, quauae ratione his in opusculis a fide alienus Lactantius sit me per epistolas doceas. Haud enim me paruo donabis munere: siquidem maximum immineat animae meae periculum. . . ."

118 Rutherford, *Early Renaissance*, 7–14 for the biography; 14–16 for the political circumstances of the dedication to Eugenius; (i) reproduction of full-folio illumination from the dedicatory copy (4r) depicting Rho kneeling to present the codex to Eugenius. For a biography and bibliography on Rho, see also Riccardo Fubini, "Antonio da Rho," *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 111 (Rome: Treccani, 1961), 574–77. Rho's *Dialogi tres in Lactantium*

the first extended commentary on Lactantius's *Divine Institutes*, with a brief foray into his *The Wrath of God*. The primary interlocutors are the ducal secretary and ambassador, Pier Candido Decembrio, and the lawyer and member of the Duke's Privy Council, Niccolò Arcimboldi.¹¹⁹ Rho described the dialogues as disputations in which "one topic led to another" or on whatever they "stumble[d] across."¹²⁰ No mystery lingers about who articulated Rho's position – in every instance 'Candido' wins the argument. The other interlocutor to express Rho's view is 'Antonio' himself. This lopsided exchange would prompt Arcimboldi to write supporting arguments for his *persona dramatis* in the margins of his own copy of the *Dialogues*.¹²¹ A list of fifty-three "errors in which deceived even Lactantius" appear as a table of contents to the dialogues.¹²² Among the fifty-three *Errata* listed, Rho interspersed the titles of another nineteen treatises that appear within the *Dialogues*. These treatises vary in length and cover a wide range of topics. Some deal with specific philosophers: Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Seneca, and Ptolemy; others deal with forms of government, judicial responsibilities, war and peace, human passions, and the quest for immortality in literature.

Rho took a hard line against Lactantius in the *Dialogues* – shockingly so to his contemporaries. Many of the errors in theology were exactly those cautionary marginalia seen first in the thirteenth century that had become optional apparatus that scribes might add after they had completed the primary text.¹²³ Most of the errors in philosophy would have been of Rho's own choosing and development. The clear exception is the material on Plato. Decembrio had recently

remain unedited, but Dr. Paul Schulten and I are working on a critical text and translation at the moment. All citations of the *Dialogi* here are from Rho's autograph, Vatican City, BAV, MS Ottob. Lat. 1903 (hereafter *Dialogi*). The dedicatory copy is Vatican City, BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 227.

119 Paolo Viti, "Decembrio, Pier Candido," *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* XXXIII (Rome: Treccani, 1987), 488–98; Nicola Raponi, "Niccolò Arcimboldi," *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* III (Rome: Treccani, 1961), 779–81.

120 *Dialogi* 14r and 47v.

121 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS D 105 sup.

122 *Dialogi* 2v–5r: "Lactentii Firmiani errata quibus ipse deceptus est..." The ms is Rho's autograph, but another hand added this list of *Errata*. Corrections and minor additions to the list appear in Rho's own hand. Rho consistently writes 'Lactentius' ('suckling' or 'infant'), perhaps a low pun on 'Lactantius' ('milky' or 'milk bearing').

123 Other 'optional apparatus' were chapter divisions, numbers, and headings; marginal indexing of names; *testimonia* of Jerome, Augustine, and others; Latin translations of the Greek text (actually, for most mss the Greek would have been the optional material and the Latin translations the ordinary material).

finished his translation of Plato's *Republic*. The *Dialogues* not only quote from his translation but they also directly reflect the arguments found in his letters from the 1430s. In them Decembrio had defended Plato against Aristotle and Lactantius for their willful misreading of the *Republic* regarding the communal possession of wives.¹²⁴ About this same time Decembrio had proposed to write a work *Against Lactantius* "in support of Plato." Some twenty years on he indicated that he had finished a book *Against Lactantius* "in defense of illustrious men."¹²⁵ It has not survived. If Decembrio in fact wrote some part of the early version "in support of Plato," I suspect that he either turned it over to Rho, his life-long friend, who transposed it into dialogue form, or that Rho's *Dialogues* had quite literally stolen its thunder. Thus when 'Candido' speaks in the Plato sections of the *Dialogues*, it is largely Decembrio's real voice that we hear.¹²⁶ For the rest of the *Dialogues*, most especially in matters theological – where Rho follows the lead of the older marginalia – but also in matters philosophical, we

124 James Hankins, *Plato in the Renaissance*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1990): on Decembrio's translation 1: 105–48; on the discussion of the *Republic* in Rho's *Dialogi* 1: 148–53; on the *Dialogi* replicating Decembrio's real positions 1: 149–50. Hankins (*Plato* 11: 596–618) has also edited this section of the *Dialogi* from Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS D 105 sup. and from Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 1678 and Arcimboldi's supplementary arguments supporting Lactantius from MS D 105 sup. For Decembrio's correspondence on this issue, see esp. Riccardo Fubini, "Tra umanesimo e concili: note e giunte a una pubblicazione recente su Francesco Pizolpasso (1370c.–1443)," *Studi Medievali* ser. 3, 7 (1966): 323–70; and Angelo Paredi, *La biblioteca del Pizolpasso* (Milan: Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, 1961). See also Vittorio Zaccaria, "Sulle opere di Pier Candido Decembrio," *Rinascimento* ser. 1, 7 (1956): 14–74; Zaccaria, "Pier Candido Decembrio traduttore della 'Repubblica' di Platone," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 2 (1959): 179–206, esp. 181–82 and 199–200; and Zaccaria, "Pier Candido Decembrio, Michele Pizolpasso e Ugolino Pisani," *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere et arti* 133 (1975): 187–212.

125 Petrus Candidus ad Symoninum Giglinum [1437–1438] (Zaccaria, "Sulle opere" 26–27): "Referam ab ipsis, ut ita dicam incunabulis... in Lactantium Firmianum pro tuitione Platonis nostri librum alterum..." Decembrio again referred to it in a letter to Francesco Visconti (Genoa, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS C.vii.46) 92r: "Sed quod maioris est ponderis librum conscripsi in Lactantium pro defensione illustrium uirorum. Deliberaui hunc tibi inscribere, nam poscitur a quibusdam doctis uiris, sed nisi ex iusu tuo id attendere praesumpsi, ne dum placere cupio displiceam. Rescribe igitur praecor an id me facere uelis in laudem tui nominis. Non scio per omnium manus diuersabitur, uariaque erunt iudicia, cum multi etiam ignorantes Lactantio afficiantur et plerumque homines ex magis laudent quae minus intellegunt. Vale. Ex Mediolano pridie Kalendas Ianuarias 1464." See also Hankins, *Plato*, 1: 150 n. 88.

126 See Hankins, *Plato*, 1: 148–52.

hear Rho. His sporadic invectives against Lactantius reveal Rho's fondness for a genre well suited to his bristly personality.¹²⁷

Some of these errors represent Rho's grinding an ax against his contemporaries, in particular Lorenzo Valla. By the 1440s Rho and Valla had already exchanged cryptic barbs, yet Rho appears unwilling to expose himself to the charge of open ingratitude. For Valla, in the 1433 version of his dialogues *On the True and False Good*, had chosen Rho as his Christian spokesman. As Valla expressed it, he had conferred on Rho the same honor that Cicero had bestowed on Scipio and Plato on Socrates.¹²⁸ According to Rho, Lactantius's many errors stem from his primary error, the rejection of philosophy. 'Candido' scorned Lactantius's assertion that "all philosophy must therefore be discarded: what is needed is not the pursuit of wisdom . . . but wisdom itself."¹²⁹ None of Rho's humanist contemporaries argued a similar position more clearly than Lorenzo Valla. According to Valla, the theology introduced by Boethius and pursued by the scholastics had inappropriately subordinated grammar and rhetoric to dialectic and philosophy. Rho would have been sensitive to this argument because 'Antonio' himself had advanced this thesis in the third dialogue of Valla's *On the True and False Good*.¹³⁰ Tellingly, in the inquisitorial process of 1444 in Naples, Valla expressed the view that "the rhetorician is greater than

127 Rutherford, *Early Renaissance*, 1–40; see also Poggio Bracciolini, *Facezie*, ed., trans., notes Marcello Ciccuto (Milan: Rizzoli, 1983), 308–09.

128 Between 1431 and 1449 Valla reworked his dialogues four times. But beyond the first version, Rho can be shown to have known only the second one written in Milan in 1433, in which his persona first appeared as Valla's christian spokesman. Valla, *Opera omnia*, ed. Eugenio Garin, 2 vols. (Turin: Botega d'Erasmus, 1962), II: 390: "Etenim . . . inter me et Antonium Raudensem quid magis ostendi potuit quam quod in libris De uero bono partes ei (ut sic dicam) censorias tribui defensionemque religionis, ut non plus in libris De republica tribuerit aut Scipioni Cicero aut Socrati Plato?" On the tension between Rho and Valla, see Mariangela Regoliosi, "Umanesimo lombardo: la polemica tra Lorenzo Valla e Antonio da Rho," *Studi di lingua e letteratura lombarda offerti a Maurizio Vitale*, 2 vols. (Pisa: Giardini, 1983), I: 170–79; and Rutherford, *Early Renaissance*, 12–14.

129 Inst. 3.16.7; Rho Dialogi 146v and 156v.

130 Valla, *De vero falsoque bono* 3.11.1–3.12.8 (Heatt and Lorch 269–73). On Valla's view of philosophy and rhetoric, see Lodi Nauta, *In Defense of Common Sense: Lorenzo Valla's Humanist Critique of Scholastic Philosophy* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2009); on Valla's use of Lactantius, see Letizia A. Panizza, "Lorenzo Valla's *De vero falsoque bono*: Lactantius and Oratorical Scepticism," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 41 (1978): 76–107; and Brian Vickers, "Valla's Ambivalent Praise of Pleasure: Rhetoric in the Service of Christianity," *Viator* 17 (1986): 271–319.

the *philosophos* [philosopher/lover of wisdom], he is *sophos* [wise].”¹³¹ When Rho wrote his *Dialogues*, he could not have known of this particular formulation of Valla’s idea. But apart from its expression in *On the True and False Good*, Rho must have heard Valla articulate similar views in their occasional conversations in Pavia and Milan in the early 1430s. In Rho’s own *Dialogues*, ‘Candido’ and ‘Niccolò’ turned to ‘Antonio’ for a solution to the problem of free will and predestination. He responded that “matters as arduous as these” can not be treated in eloquent language, for they “exceed and transcend the *studia humanitatis*.” Cicero, he said, did not manifest the same eloquence in his *De topicis* that he did in his *De oratore*; Augustine spoke one way in *On Christian Doctrine* but another way in *On the Trinity*. In the former a rhetorical spirit seems to have inspired Augustine, in the latter a divine spirit. ‘Antonio’ concluded: “divine utterances, after all, don’t have to submit to the precepts of Cicero.”¹³²

If Rho had resisted his penchant for invective, he may have achieved a much higher standing as a critical reader of Lactantius.¹³³ He sorted through vast amounts of literature, patristic and philosophical, to explain Lactantius’s positions. But in focusing only on what he thought Lactantius had got wrong, Rho undercut the potential interest in his *Dialogues*. His central insights into Lactantius’s work are, for all that, still interesting and even perceptive. Unlike Isidore and Gilbert, he made no attempt to recast Lactantius into a text supporting his own philosophic interests and ideas. In fact, he censured his contemporaries precisely for such attempts. Rho took Lactantius’s attack on philosophy seriously – and disagreed with it vehemently. He either failed to perceive or refused to endorse Lactantius’s motives for wanting to devalue philosophy. Lactantius, Rho thought, had argued for radical rejection of philosophy. In pursuing this line, Lactantius had tried to “bury or extinguish” every

131 Valla is here quoted from Salvatore I. Camporeale, “Lorenzo Valla tra Medioevo e Rinascimento: ‘Encomion S. Thomae’ – 1457,” *Memorie Domenicane* n.s. 7 (1976): 11–194, esp. 123–24.

132 *Dialogi* 107r: “Nolo tamen elegantias illas uestras, cultum sermonis, splendoremque uerborum ex me rebus in his tam arduis expectetis, studia namque humanitatis excedunt transcenduntque . . . Cicero cum *De topicis* . . . non eam eloquentiam seruare potuit quam in . . . eo *De oratore* seruauit . . . Aliter quoque diuus Augustinus in eo *De doctrina christiana* et ad eloquentissimum Hieronymum locutus est, aliter in eo quem *De trinitate* edidit. Ibi rhetorico quidem spiritu, hic non rhetorico sed diuino uidetur afflatus: diuina uidelicet eloquia praeceptis Ciceronis non habentur obnoxia.”

133 See Hankins, *Plato*, 1: 153–54 for observations on the greater willingness to pursue something akin to historical criticism of Plato among Milanese than among Florentine humanists.

philosophical sect. He had attacked philosophers indiscriminately: Socrates, Plato, Epicurus, Arcesilaus, Zeno, and many others, not least among them Cicero.¹³⁴ His insistence that wisdom only “resides in heaven and originates from there” had led him to believe that the title ‘philosopher’ was “a vacuous and inane word.” For although philosophers were “devotees and lovers of wisdom,” they had failed to achieve wisdom because “they sought it on earth.”¹³⁵ Rho thought that Lactantius fell into this error because he had adopted the old Stoic doctrine that admitted no middle ground between the sage and the fool, between the good person and the bad.¹³⁶ Rho may have this right. One is reminded of Stephen Casey’s observation that Lactantius was thoroughly versed in Stoic logic and employed it frequently.¹³⁷ Rho acknowledged that human wisdom looks foolish when compared to God’s wisdom. This did not absolve humans from the responsibility of striving to acquire it. “Rarely,” ‘Candido’ says, “is wisdom infused into mortals from on high. Should I wait sleeping and listless and expect heaven to bestow it on me?”¹³⁸

In seeking to expose Lactantius’s errors, Rho offered another insight regarding Lactantius’s work. On the one hand, Rho did admire Lactantius’s eloquence. In the early 1430s he admonished his students to imitate daily Cicero, Livy, and Lactantius, the paragons of eloquence, rather than Horace and Persius,

134 *Dialogi* 146r–v: “Omnes enim sectas insectatur: nunc Academicos, nunc Epicureos, nunc Stoicos, Peripateticos, Cyrenaicos invadit. Omnis aut sepelire aut extinguere contendit. Socrati detrahit, Platonem lacerat, Epicuro insultat, Archesilam carpit, Zenonem incusat, et cum multis praeteream, Ciceronem minime praetereo. Huiusce uiri nec umquam nec usquam obliuiscitur, prae oculis illum fert et obicem pedibus semper habet quem undique lacessit et mordet.” Rho speaks similarly elsewhere: *Dialogi* 9v and 99v.

135 *Dialogi* 146v: “Credit siquidem Firmianus noster – et hoc loco ita docet et disputat – nullam in terris esse sapientiam, uerum eam caelum incolere caeloque natam, philosophos ergo uacuo quodam et inani uocabulo nominatos esse, quippe qui studiosi et amatores sapientiae quam terris uenabantur nec eam offendebant dicebantur.” Cf. Lact. *Inst.* 3.2.6–3.2.2.

136 *Dialogi* 146v–147r: “. . . uerum Lactentius toto hoc suo tertio [libro], quoniam perfectum ab imperfecto secernere neglexit aut nesciuit, deceptus est. . . . Credidit utique Firmianus ipse cum Zenone stoico, nisi qui perfecte esset sapiens neminem esse sapientem et neminem aliquas uirtutes habere nisi omnis haberet. Inde dicebat nullo sapiente aliquem sapientiore nulloque iusto aliquem esse iustiore. Media igitur officia derelinquens, de perfectis dumtaxat locutus est.”

137 See here n. 5.

138 *Dialogi* 146v: “Raro e celo sapientia mortalibus infunditur. Utrum dormitans et iners celitus illa mihi donetur expectauerim?”

whose style Rho thought was extremely opaque.¹³⁹ On the other hand, Rho voiced displeasure with his contemporaries, who, enchanted by Lactantius's eloquence, refused to examine critically what Lactantius actually said. Modern scholars, as noted earlier, have often observed that Lactantius's discussion of philosophy and philosophers is embedded in his rhetoric and that he followed the well established path of the doxographers. This no doubt gave Lactantius's Renaissance readers much the same assistance that it had given to Isidore and Gilbert. Lactantius's use of protreptic methods in order to undermine the positions described and to bring his audience to his own position did not suit all of his Renaissance readers. A fundamental weakness of Lactantius, according to Rho, was that he at one moment took a position regarding a particular philosopher or school of philosophy and at some later point he would argue nearly the opposite. Rho found this infuriating. In the second dialogue 'Candido' stated that it was shameful for a philosopher to reverse himself as if he failed to recall what he had just said. "Perhaps *lawyers* must be allowed such latitude when pleading a case, but *philosophers* never!"¹⁴⁰ Rho's insight was correct; his reaction was caustic. He had no sympathy for Lactantius's observation that Christians did not need another philosopher but rather a good lawyer.

Earlier 'Candido' had said that Lactantius's "principles, arguments, and narrations" often consisted only of rhetorical flourishes. Speaking hurriedly and rashly, "he abuses his spurs and needs to apply the reins." After examining Lactantius's discussion of Cicero, 'Candido' wondered why Lactantius had "silenced the truth" of the very philosopher whom he considered his teacher in

139 Rho, "Oratio ad scholares (1431/32)," in *Reden und Briefe italienischer Humanisten*, ed. Karl Müllner (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1899), 166 [my punctuation]: "Vestrae autem partes erunt artis praecepta percipere, Ciceronem Livium Lactantium – non Flaccum aut Persium, perobscuros quidem – aemulari, singulos dies aliquid scribere, non iucundo otio marcescere sed assidua exercitatione fervere." Rho again in 1444 presents Cicero, Livy, and Lactantius as the supreme models of eloquence (*Dialogi* 8v).

140 Similar views of L's tactics, but assessed positively – restricted to the Hermetic and Sibylline quotations – are expressed by Oliver Nicholson, "L. lines up his witnesses like a lawyer" ("Broadening the Roman Mind," 368), and by Stefan Freund, "Apollo is presented as [an] involuntary chief witness . . . in favour of the Christians' cause by their clever lawyer L.," ("Christian Use," 281). *Dialogi* 62r: "Turpissimum quidem est et admodum infame philosophum se uideri uelle et predicari, e regione quae omnino inuicem aduersantur nec inesse simul ullo pacto queant, docere, insinuare, et affirmare molitur. Hi qui sunt? Plane qui exigui cerebri persepe a memoria excidunt, et quae ex antea docuerint, postmodum obliuiscantur et impugnent. Oratoribus quidem ea illa suadentibus uenia fortasse condonanda uideretur, at philosophis neitquam."

order “to force contradictions between what Cicero wrote and what he meant.”¹⁴¹ Lactantius should be hissed off stage and “expelled with true reasonings from the society of philosophers lest the whole community perish.”¹⁴² Praising someone for merely having been a member of the Academy or a student at Athens was misguided. Lactantius ought “to return to the rhetorical school to teach boys.”¹⁴³ Rho means, clearly, that use of Lactantius’s writings should be restricted to teaching boys good Latin style.

Most of Rho’s contemporaries were shocked at his brazen attack on Lactantius. Francesco Filelfo wrote to Rho expressing disgust and wondering what had motivated Rho write such a work.¹⁴⁴ A certain Adam of Genova wrote a short poem counseling Rho to go back on his medication, that is, his hellebore, the ancient remedy for insanity.¹⁴⁵ Niccolò Arcimboldi wrote a letter to Rho expressing his disappointment and affixed it along with his supplementary arguments supporting Lactantius to his personal copy of the *Dialogues*.¹⁴⁶ The dedicatory manuscript in the Vatican Library contains a marginal note by Decembrio indicating that Eugenius IV had read most of the first dialogue in 1443, the only part finished at that time.¹⁴⁷ No specific reaction from Eugenius

141 *Dialogi* 134v: “Quid enim inhonestius quam praeceptoris sui eiusdemque philosophi tacita ueritate deprauare sententias et litteram ad sensum suum trahere repugnantem?”

142 *Dialogi* 45r: “Verum quando alios irridet, ipse primus quidem risui habendus est. Neque id satis nisi rationibus ueris, ut non tota plebs pereat, explosus et extrusus e philosophorum cetu eiiciatur.”

143 *Dialogi* 45v: “Sed ad ludum declamatorium, quo pueros erudiat redeat oportet. Non enim Academie aut Athenis fuisse ceterum istic scientia et litteris profecisse laudandum est.”

144 Francesco Filelfo, *Epistolare* (Basel: Nicolaus Kessler, 1506), fol. 13v: “Vellem equidem . . . ab omni istiusmodi scribendi genere te continuisses. . . . Quae enim per immortalem deum phanatica ratio te commouit, ut perinde atque infesto quodam atque inimico afflatus spiritu in uirum doctissimum atque disertissimum tam insolenter tam iniuste tam impie inuehereris, ut non res solum paene innumerabilis consulto male interpreteris sed nomen etiam uiri deprauare studueris, utpote quem Lactensium pro Lactantio nomines? . . . Rogo igitur te ut in hac re Aurelium Augustinum imiteris. . . . Retracta etiam tu, si tibi constas quae sciens uolensque male scripsisti. . . .”

145 Adamus Genuensis (*Patrologia Latina* 6: 63 n. 2): “Hic male corripuit stolidis Antonius ausis / auctorem. . . / nam te pensitat elleborum.”

146 See here nn. 121 and 124.

147 The note in Decembrio’s hand (MS Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 227, 48r) reads: “Sanctissime pater Eugeni, hucusque legit Sanctitas uestra in primo codice per me P. Candidum Senas delato. 1442.” The Sienese New Year was March 25. Eugenius entered Siena on March 11. Decembrio’s note is, then, either written during or refers to the period between March 11 and March 24, 1443 [NS]. Internal testimony indicates that the *Dialogues* were not

himself exists. In addition to the dedicatory copy and Rho's autograph of the *Dialogues*, five other manuscripts of the work circulated.

Rho's list of *Errata*, however, has hounded Lactantius from the *editio princeps* of 1465 through the publication of the *Patrologia Latina* (1844).¹⁴⁸ This last contained three modified versions of the *Errata*. Lactantius's *opera* were printed fourteen times in the fifteenth century and thirty-six times in the sixteenth century. All but a very few of the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century editions, and many thereafter contain some version of the *Errata*.¹⁴⁹ The people who made substantial investments in the publication of Lactantius's *opera* were the same who chose to include the *Errata*. In the early years they probably had papal encouragement to do so.¹⁵⁰ The most convincing explanation for the repeated inclusion of the *Errata*, however, must be that printers thought that attaching the *Errata* made their product better or more attractive to the buyer. Confirmation of this is reflected in people later copying the list into earlier manuscripts and into the few printed editions that had omitted them. But too much emphasis should not be placed on the 'market forces,' that is, on a given printer's perceptions of what a potential buyer wanted. Numerous studies indicate that early printing resulted from a combination of patronage and

completed until 1444 (*Dialogi* 84r): "nos qui post Christum quattuor et quadraginta supra mille et quadringentos annos agimus. . ."

148 The literature on the 1465 edition of Lactantius is enormous, but see esp. *Gutenberg e Roma: Le origini della stampa nella città dei papi, 1467–1477* (Naples: Electa, 1997) ed. Massimo Miglio and Orietta Rossini; see also Anna Modigliani, *Tipografi a Roma prima della stampa: due società per fare libri con le forme, 1466–1470* (Rome: Roma nel Rinascimento, 1989); and *Umanesimo e padri della Chiesa: Manoscritti e incunaboli di testi patristici da Francesco Petrarca al primo Cinquecento* (Rome: Rose, 1997) ed. Sebastiano Gentile. On the *Patrologia Latina* or the *Migne* series, see R. Howard Bloch, *God's Plagiarist: Being an Account of the Fabulous Industry and Irregular Commerce of the Abbe Migne* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

149 Two kinds of variations on Rho's *Errata* are commonly seen: (1) a reordering of the list according to their appearance in each book of *Institutes*, a reordering that initially appeared in the second printing of L. by Sweynheym and Pannartz in 1468, and (2) a purging of Rho's most scathing language against L., which was mostly accomplished from the sixteenth century onwards. For the sixteenth century I count only the *opera* editions, not the many editions containing various poems ascribed to L.

150 See here n. 148. At the Renaissance Society of America Conference, 2002, Scottsdale, AZ, Massimo Miglio made a compelling case that the popes took an active oversight role in early printing in and around Rome. I have found no explicit evidence regarding editions of Lactantius, but I concur completely with Massimo Miglio's position. This would apply not only to the earliest editions of Lactantius but also to the second edition of the Albrecht von Eyb's *Margarita poetica* discussed below.

commercial interests. Books that enthused the *literati* and *cognoscenti* were apt, especially in the first few decades, to be the ones chosen for publication whether the market demanded them or not.

With the repeated printing of Lactantius's *opera* from 1465 onwards, his works became increasingly available to readers. They could now evaluate his approach to philosophy with the help of indexes of varying quality along with Rho's list of *Errata*. In the course of the sixteenth century, various notes and glosses also began to accompany the text. This continued publication and expanding distribution meant that his work was now readily available to those who were anxious to grind an ax on some issue. As these contentious times wore on, the range of issues grew.

An early example of this, which will conclude our discussion, can be seen in the substantial selections from Lactantius's *opera* that began to circulate only seven years after the Subiaco *editio princeps*. In 1472 the Nürnberg printer Johann Sensenschmidt printed the *Margarita poetica* (*Poetic Pearl*) of Albrecht von Eyb (1420–75).¹⁵¹ Albrecht had finished his manuscript of this collection in 1459, the same year that he became a *doctor utriusque juris* at Pavia.¹⁵² By

151 See esp. Teresa Jiménez Calvente, "La *Margarita poetica* de Albrecht von Eyb: una exitosa miscelánea olvidada," *Revista de poética medieval* 7 (2001): 133–57; Latin text and Spanish trans. of Albrecht's letter of dedication 133–37. The title, Albrecht says, derives as much from his mother's name, Lady Margaret (Margarita) von Ivoldmershausen, who first taught him to read, as from the brilliance of the jewels that humans admire (Calvente 134–35). His autograph copy is: Eichstätt, Universitätsbibliothek Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, MS st. 633 (Colophon: "Gloria Alberti nullum moritura per evum. 1459"). Eyb's ms of L. containing his marginalia is: Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, MS 2° cod. 10. See Gerhard Klecha, "Albrecht von Eyb," in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, eds. Kurt Ruh, Gundolf Keil, Werner Schröder, Burghart Wachinger, and Franz Josef Worstbrock (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978), 180–86; and John L. Flood, "Parallel Lives: Heinrich Steinhöwel, Albrecht von Eyb, and Niklas von Wyle," in *Camden House History of German Literature*, IV, *Early Modern German Literature, 1300–1700*, ed. Max Reinhart (Rochester, NY: Boydell and Brewer, 2007), 779–96, esp. 782–86. The two older studies are: Max Herrmann, *Albrecht von Eyb und die Frühzeit des deutschen Humanismus* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1893) and Joseph A. Hiller, "Albrecht von Eyb: Medieval Moralizer," (Diss., Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1939). The critical editions of his German works are: Albrecht von Eyb, *Spiegel der Sitten*, ed. Gerhard Klecha, *Texte des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit* 34 (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1989) and *Deutsche Schriften des Albrecht Von Eyb, Band 1: Das Ehebüchlein* (1890), ed. Max Herrmann, Kessinger Legacy Reprints (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2010).

152 Albrecht studied at Erfurt from 1436 to 1438. Between 1444 and 1459 he studied in Pavia, Bologna, Padua, and again in Pavia. While in Italy he became especially close friends with

1503, its last printing, it had gone to press thirteen more times in Rome, Paris, Strasbourg, Toulouse, Basel, and Venice.

The 1472 edition of the *Margarita*, its first printing, comprised 452 folios, divided into three parts: (1) letter writing, (2) model (*auctoritates*) orators and poets, and (3) orations. Of the model orators and poets, Albrecht assembled substantial extracts from Cicero (37 folios), from Lactantius (63 folios), followed by brief extracts from Apuleius, Orosius, Victorinus of Petau, Julius Caesar, Valerius Maximus, Petrarca, Terence, and Plautus (142 folios).¹⁵³ The Lactantius excerpts came from each book of the *Divine Institutes* and from *The Wrath of God* and *The Workmanship of God*. Albrecht did not resort to summaries or paraphrases, offering only verbatim quotations and adding the rare brief phrase or word to tie things together. The material within a given book is mostly but not strictly sequential.

For book 3 of the *Institutes*, Lactantius's main discussion of philosophy, Albrecht's early excerpts concern the dismissal of natural philosophy as productive or as anything more than vacuous speculation. The remaining selections focus on moral philosophy, with an emphasis on the after-life as the supreme good. It includes Lactantius's statement that religion is the unique characteristic which distinguishes humans from all other animals and his view that the proper worship of God is essential for human morality. Albrecht squeezed out all but the faintest traces of Lactantius's discussion of the various branches of philosophy, of the different views of the respective philosophical schools, and even their different views of the *summum bonum*. What Albrecht left was the simple claim that all philosophers had contradicted one another and Lactantius's own view of the *summum bonum* and the moral life. Any reader unfamiliar with the full text of book 3 would justly conclude that Lactantius had written a narrowly focused moral treatise containing a few vague references to philosophy. Albrecht even strips moral philosophy, a frequent humanist preoccupation, of the historical trappings that so captivated them.

In the heading for Part 2 on "Model Orators and Poets," Albrecht explained that all of the material assembled was intended to make his contemporaries elegant letter writers and speakers.¹⁵⁴ In his concluding oration *On the Completion and Publication of this Work*, he again articulated this purpose. Although the

the Bolognese humanist Giovanni Lamola (ca.1405–49) and the Pavian professor of rhetoric and law Baldassare Rassinini (d. 1468).

153 For a breakdown of its contents, see Hiller, "Albrecht von Eyb," 70–74.

154 Eyb, *Marg. poet.* (pt. 2, cap.): "Auctoritates diuersorum tam oratorum quam poetarum uiuorum sane clarissimorum quibus omnem nostram epistolandi rationem et dicendi modum corroborare, exornare, et maxime amplificare possumus."

Margarita excerpts authors openly, in composing his epilogue, or concluding oration, Albrecht cribbed heavily with no thought of crediting his sources. He began by working in a few lines from Lactantius (3.1.3, 1.1.20, 1.1.10) and even some lines from the Divine Office. Then comes an extended passage (2 folios) in which he alternated between plagiarizing Leonardo Bruni's *Letter to Battista Malatesta* (*De studiis et litteris*) and Lactantius's *Institutes* (5.1.24–28). Since neither of these authors are acknowledged, the text reads as though Albrecht has written this for and about his German contemporaries. He cribbed from Bruni a passage in which Plato, Democritus, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Varro, Cicero, Seneca, Augustine, Jerome, and Lactantius are praised because one could scarcely decide what was greater, “their knowledge of things or their skill in literature.” He then purloined a line from Cicero (*Rep.* 6.18.4) which noted that many others with outstanding talent had cultivated these studies in his own time, so that, Albrecht says,

wisdom and truth in consequence have no proper champions, and scholars who came to their rescue were inadequate to defend them. This is the principle reason why holy scripture lacks the trust of the wise, both scholars and princes of this world: its prophets have spoken to suit ordinary folk, in plain and ordinary language; they thus earn the contempt of people who will not read or hear anything not polished and eloquent. Nothing sticks in such people's minds unless it soothes their ears with its smoothness, and anything seeming coarse they think is stuff for old women, stupid and vulgar. Anything rough on the ears they assume is untrue, and nothing is credible unless it provides aesthetic pleasure; they weigh by garb and not by truth.

Although Max Herrmann (1893) called attention to this section of the oration, neither he nor Joseph Hiller (1939) were aware that Albrecht was cribbing heavily from Lactantius and Bruni.¹⁵⁵ Herrmann and Hiller thought it was Albrecht's take on the German elites of his day. In some curious way it is. The passage just cited (*Inst.* 5.1.21, 5.1.15–17, trans. Bowen and Garnsey) stands out as one of the most ironic anachronisms in Lactantius's many reiterations. That this statement could slip from a reference to fourth-century Roman elites directly into an observation on fifteenth-century German elites provokes no

155 Herrmann, *Albrecht von Eyb*, 198–201, 359–60; and Hiller, “Albrecht von Eyb,” 162–64, 78–83. Albrecht translated most of this oration into German to serve as introduction to his *Spiegel der Sitten*. See here n. 151 and the critical edition of Albrecht von Eyb, *Spiegel der Sitten* by Gerhard Klecha, 20–21, 26–7.

little amazement, not to say amusement. Italian humanists of this time were wont to lament that their fellow Italians spoke so barbarously that little hope remained of restoring Latin eloquence.¹⁵⁶ As this passage reads, Albrecht was far more impressed with the situation in the Germanies.

In conclusion, several observations can be made about Lactantius's writings on philosophy and about how readers in his own day and for many centuries thereafter appropriated, adapted, and reacted to his work. First, Lactantius saw philosophy (and some philosophers) as a threat to Christians generally and to himself personally. At the close of book 2 he previewed the "greater and more difficult struggle" that faced him in book 3. He would now, as he said, have to "wrestle with the philosophers, whose great learning and eloquence loom like a mountain in my path."¹⁵⁷ He knew that the long-standing authority and reputation of the philosophers could neither be skirted nor easily refuted. His clear objective was to cut philosophy down to size. Academic skepticism had brought his goal within reach. His strategy was to reduce philosophy to mere human guesswork – intelligent guesswork, but still guesswork. This then allowed him to articulate his vision of divine wisdom and truth. Philosophers of his own day had at least tacitly accepted this premise and were resorting to divine oracles themselves. Second, Lactantius brought all of his rhetorical training to bear in presenting his case. He knew how to talk to his peers – people who had learned their philosophy and rhetoric from Cicero just as he had – and how to speak of philosophers, however accurately, in a way that resonated with his audience. Many of his views found a powerful ally in the emperor Constantine himself and, for a few generations, within ecclesiastical circles as well. Third, in the course of the late fifth and sixth centuries the threats that Lactantius faced withered away. Philosophy no longer menaced Christian thought; rather, its passing threatened Christian thought. The cultural and educational world that had produced the Church's great luminaries was now transformed. Evident in Cassiodorus and vital for Isidore, Lactantius's writings on philosophy both transmitted and filtered this distant philosophical past. Lactantius's objectives did not square with Isidore's. Isidore no longer needed or wanted to diminish philosophy. He wanted to restore philosophy to the curriculum of the Christian clergy. He did not see it as a threat but rather as a worthy ally. The Lactantius of the *Etymologies* was not the Lactantius of the *Institutes*. He was a shadow of his former self. But in Isidore's journey

156 Gianfrancesco Pico, *De imitatione* 3.18, and Celio Calcagnini, *De imitatione* 8.4–6, in *Ciceronian Controversies*, ed. Joann Dellaneva, trans. Brian Duick, The I Tatti Renaissance Library (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).

157 *Inst.* 2.19.1–6.

among the shades, that of Lactantius loomed large. Fourth, it should not be assumed that either Isidore or later readers in the Middle Ages were unable to read Lactantius's writings on philosophy critically. Much evidence in the manuscript marginalia indicates that they could. Most readers of Lactantius had neither the opportunity nor the interest to transpose him into a new idiom or give him a new voice, as first did Isidore and then Gilbert. However curious Lactantius looks once filtered for etymological or scholastic purposes, his writings and his ideas still mattered. Not as they had mattered to him, but as they mattered in circumstances far removed from the world he knew or could ever have imagined. Fifth, readers of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries again admired his rhetoric. Inevitably, the interest in form opened the door to content. For readers fascinated with the classical past, Lactantius's doxographical approach to philosophy made him a rich vein of information. His works even now engage classicists excavating fragments of lost works. There is no little irony that the telling critique of Jerome, the man with nightmares of being "a Ciceronian, not a Christian," would elevate Lactantius to the now enviable status of the "Christian Cicero." Jerome's fears did not stalk the humanists of the fifteenth century. Jerome, as others surely before him, had recognized that Lactantius held theological views that the church had since repudiated, some forcefully. Quiet doubts lingered for centuries. But Decembrio and Rho made open objections, not only to his theological views but also to his philosophical analyses, especially as affected by his protreptic objectives and his consummate skill as an advocate. Albrecht's *Margarita* came at the moment when Lactantius's works were beginning to pour off the presses. It comprised, however, a curious mix of the traditional and innovative values that are too facily glossed as either Medieval or Renaissance. He preserved Lactantius's form, consistent with new enthusiasms, but abridged the content, consistent with old values.

The circulation, reappraisals, adaptations, and influence of Lactantius's writings were the result of a constellation of factors: material, political, religious, and cultural. Such is true for any author. In the case of Lactantius's philosophical reflections, the two primary factors facilitating their circulation and use lay within the cultural realm, specifically in the doxographical and rhetorical traditions. His philosophical doxography carried significant weight throughout the various moments of cultural resurgence in the West from late Antiquity through the Renaissance. After the late fifth and sixth century, the rhetorical aspects of Lactantius's discussions of philosophy often failed to resonate with his readers. But readers still found ways to work through his rhetoric or recast his thoughts into forms and idioms more appropriate to their times.

Only among the Renaissance humanists did the enthusiasm for Lactantius's rhetorical form match the interest in his doxographical content. This also came at a fortunate moment when the material and technological means to replicate his works surpassed what had been possible even in late antiquity. These same forces made available the writings of many ancient philosophers. Lactantius could still prove a valuable introduction to their thought. But the ancient philosophers were recovering their voices too.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁸ I thank John Monfasani for suggesting this topic to me some years ago for our panel at the Renaissance Society of America conference and for his subsequent advice. In substantially revising and expanding the present version, I am grateful to Arthur Field, Colin McAllister, Paul Schulten, and my wife Susan Narucki for their careful reading and valuable advice, which contributed significant improvements and clarifications.

Andreas Chrysoberges' *Dialogue* against Mark Eugenikos

Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel

Introduction

The Council of Florence was a key event in the lives of the main Greek subjects of John Monfasani's research: George of Trebizond, Cardinal Bessarion, George Amiroutzes, Gemistus Pletho, and Theodore of Gaza. This article concerns two Greek archbishops who debated each other at the council from opposite sides: Mark Eugenikos and Andreas Chrysoberges. Mark, archbishop of Ephesos, was the only Greek representative of note who refused to accept the union between the Greek and Latin Churches reached at the council. Afterwards, he became the leading Byzantine opponent of the union, composing letters in which he charged the Latins with a number of errors and heresies. Andreas was a Dominican, then serving as archbishop of Rhodes, although later he would become archbishop of Nicosia. In the early 1440s, Andreas was compelled by the charges in Mark's letters to compose a "Dialogue against Mark, Pontiff of the Ephesians, who Damns the Rites and Sacrifices of the Roman Church, Composed by Friar Andreas, Archbishop of Rhodes, to the Citizens of Methoni" [fol. 1r], that is, Venetian Modon, on the southwest tip of the Peloponnesos. We here present the *editio princeps* of the *Dialogue*, preserved in the Vatican Library, MS Palat. Lat. 604. The text is in Latin with Greek quotations, and while John Monfasani could have edited the *Dialogue* in both languages himself, we have had to form a team. Due to space limitations, this brief

* We would like to thank William Duba for describing in such detail the manuscript in the Vatican, which supplied a reproduction, Fritz Saaby Pedersen for fixing Schabel's Latin, Claudine Delacroix-Besnier for materials, and John Monfasani himself, who sent comments without knowing where this paper would end up! This edition began as a project in Schabel's postgraduate palaeography class (for the Byzantine Studies and Classical Studies programs of the University of Cyprus) in the fall of 2008, in which the text was divided into 56 sections and the fourteen students did rough transcriptions of varying quality. Since no one opted to work on the text as the basis for an MA thesis, we decided to do the edition.

introduction will focus on dating and on certain textual questions, leaving aside the broader doctrinal and historical context.¹

The earliest *terminus post quem* for the *Dialogue* is 28 September 1439, when Andreas was given safe conduct to depart from Florence and return to the East, while the latest *terminus ante quem* is April 1447, when Andreas was appointed archbishop of Nicosia.² Mark's own activities narrow these dates considerably. Mark arrived with Emperor John VIII Palaiologos in the Byzantine capital on 1 February 1440, and then set off for Ephesos on 4 May. From there he soon sailed for Mount Athos, but he stopped on Lemnos, where he was arrested on the emperor's orders. He was imprisoned for two years on the island, and upon his release on 4 August 1442 he went to Constantinople, where he died on 23 June 1444 in the monastery St George of Mangana.³ Presumably, Andreas would have known about Mark's death within a few months, so our *terminus ante quem* can probably be moved back to late 1444. Andreas' references and quotations allow us to identify the letter he is responding to as the one Mark sent "To George the Presbyter in Modon," which has been edited. Unfortunately, it is dated vaguely "1440 or 1441," apparently during Mark's imprisonment on Lemnos.⁴

The first firm date we have for Andreas after he left the council is a letter from Pope Eugene IV of 5 November 1441 ordering Andreas to investigate the complaints of the Greek bishops of Cyprus that the Latins there were not communing with them in accordance with the union of Florence.⁵ The pope

- 1 For the *Dialogue* in its context, see Claudine Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains et la Chrétienté grecque aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles* (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1997), 368–378, and on Andreas in general 173–179, 287–315, 366–381, 390–405, and *passim*, and eadem, "André Chrysoberghès O.P. Prélate grec de l'Église latine," in *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII–XV secolo)*, eds. Chryssa A. Maltezou and Peter Schreiner (Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini, 2002), 419–433. Some remarks on the *Dialogue* are in Chris Schabel, "The Quarrel over Unleavened Bread in Western Theology, 1234–1439," in *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*, ed. Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 85–127, at 125–127. For the council, see Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: CUP, 1959), esp. 144–153. For Mark, see Nicholas Conostas, "Mark Eugenikos," in *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition II (XIII^e–XIX^e s.)*, ed. Carmelo G. Conticello and Vassa Conticello (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 411–475, with extensive bibliography.
- 2 *Acta Eugenii papae IV (1431–1447)*, ed. Giorgio Fedalto (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990), no. 843, p. 398; Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains et la Chrétienté grecque*, 367 and 380.
- 3 Conostas, "Mark Eugenikos," 420–421.
- 4 Conostas, "Mark Eugenikos," 427, text no. 26.
- 5 *Epistolae pontificiae ad concilium Florentinum spectantes*, ed. Georgius Hofmann (Rome: Pontificio Istituto di studi orientali, 1940–1946), III, no. 254, at 41.5–9 (the summary on 39 states that Andreas is ordered to go to Cyprus).

does not actually order Andreas to proceed to Cyprus in person, however, as has been claimed, nor does he state that Andreas is on Rhodes at the time, although in a letter of 7 August 1445 Eugene relates that he sent Andreas “to parts of the East and the island of Cyprus” after union with the Armenians (1439), Jacobites (1442), and Mesopotamians (1444) had been achieved.⁶ Although Andreas could have written the *Dialogue* anywhere between Rome and Cyprus, from late 1440 to late 1444, we tentatively date its composition to Rhodes 1441 or Cyprus 1442.

In the *Dialogue*, Andreas states that many days had passed since a courier brought him Mark’s letter on behalf of the citizens of Modon. They asked Andreas to provide them with arguments to respond to the blaspheming here-siarch. As part of his *captatio benevolentiae*, Andreas claims that a fever has slowed his answer, but in order to avoid undue delay, he gives his response now, hoping to write more and better when he recovers [fol. 1r–v]. Andreas says that he will quote the parts of Mark’s letter directly, providing in addition a Latin translation for those less familiar with Greek [fols. 1v–2r], which makes one wonder which public Andreas wished to address. Since Mark’s letter was in Greek, and most of the Latin-rite inhabitants of Modon probably had at least passive knowledge of the language, it was likely Andreas’ ultimate intention to reach a broader public than he avows in his letter, including the pope himself. To make it more enjoyable, Andreas remarks that he will present his arguments in the form of a dialogue, “in the manner of Plato” [fol. 3r]. Andreas thus chose a literary form that was rising in popularity, although most Renaissance humanist dialogues were more Ciceronian than Platonic.⁷ Nevertheless, ever since 1054, Latin-rite theologians had been composing tracts against the Greeks in dialogue form, ranging from apparent representations of real conversations to complete fiction.⁸

Except for the end of the salutation (about one line of text), Andreas reproduces the entirety of Mark’s letter, although he breaks it up into five small quotations [fols. 2r, 2r–v, 39r–v, 54v–55v, 57r] and one large one [fols. 24r–25v]. Thus

6 Ibid., no. 283, 106, 1.4.

7 On the genre and its forms, see, e.g., David Marsh, *The Quattrocento Dialogue. Classical Tradition and Humanist Innovation* (Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1980), at 6 for Plato’s inspiration.

8 In the eleventh century, for example, see Humbert of Silva Candida, *Adversus Graecorum calumnias* (PL 143, coll. 929–974); for the twelfth, Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogus* (PL 188, coll. 1139–1248); for the thirteenth, Girolamo Golubovich, “Disputatio Latinorum et Graecorum seu Relatio Apocrisiariorum Gregorii ix de gestis Nicaeae in Bithynia et Nymphaeae in Lydia, 1234,” *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 12 (1919): 418–470; for the fourteenth, Richard FitzRalph, *Summa de quaestionibus Armenorum*, ed. Johannes Sudoris (Paris: Iehan Petit, 1511).

the *Dialogue* is one of the principal witnesses for Mark's letter, particularly since in all other manuscripts the last paragraph of the text is missing. Indeed, Petit used the manuscript of Andreas' *Dialogue* for his edition of Mark's letter, in addition to employing Andreas' Latin translation for his own translation in the parallel column.⁹

Andreas also quotes from the Greek of Gregory of Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, the Pseudo-Dionysius, John of Damascus, and Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, while indirectly via Mark's letter there are quotations from Maximus Confessor and Basil the Great. In the case of the Bible quotation [fols. 3v–4r], the Latin translation comes from the Vulgate, as do numerous smaller Latin biblical quotations (without the Greek). For the remainder, it appears that Andreas gives his own translation of the Greek original. The Latin of the small passage from John of Damascus [fol. 19r], for example, does not match that of the popular version of Burgundio of Pisa. Some of the Greek texts that Andreas quotes and translates had, to the best of our knowledge, never before been translated into Latin, such as Gregory of Nazianzen's *Oratio* 29. It is not clear why certain passages are quoted in the original Greek and then translated, whereas others are given only in the Latin version, as for example the quote from Maximus' *Epistola ad Marinum*.

The Manuscript and the Edition

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Palat. lat. 604, is a high quality vellum manuscript, probably with a date close to that of the composition of the text, measuring 130x205mm, bound skin to skin and flesh to flesh, in 60 folios of six quinions, with single paper fly leaves on either end (binding probably 19th century). There are *reclamantes* at the end of each quire with “.” above, left, right, and below each catch word in the first four quires. There are signatures on the bottom right of 12r (“g”), 22r (“iii?”), 23r (“ii”), 51r (“1”), and 52r (“2”), and the folios are numbered with Arabic numerals in the upper right. Ruled by a sharp instrument, with 4 lines outlining the writing area (80x130mm) as a simple rectangle, all lines going to the edge, prick marks (hand-done, not rolled or combed) visible on fols. 2 (partially), 35 (a bit), and 59 (fairly complete). 21 lines

9 Mark's letter is in Louis Petit, *Documents relatifs au concile de Florence. II. Oeuvres anticonciliaires de Marc d'Éphèse. Documents VII–XXIV. Textes édités et traduits* (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1924), 470–474 (see 470, n. a). See also the reprint, *Concilium Florentinum documenta et scriptores*, series A, vol. 10/2 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1977), 162–166.

per page, with writing below the first ruled line. On folio 1r (for black and white reproduction, see the frontispiece of Delacroix-Besnier's book) there are possible previous library shelf marks: top left, "C.64/1695"; top center, "502"; bottom left, "185"; with "604.Pal." in the bottom center. After the five-line title in blue, there is a five-line high initial "A" in gold leaf with red, green, and blue details in an interlace pattern. On the bottom (see color reproduction on the cover of Delacroix-Besnier's book) is a blue shield with a dove with blue and pink floral details. The shield is surmounted by a yellowish cross and held up by two putti with yellowish wings. The dialogue, the only text that the codex contains, is in Latin, in a clear humanist miniscule, with quotations in Greek on fols. 2r-v, 18r-v, 19r, 22r, 24r-26v, 34v, 37r-v, 39r-v, 41r-v, 54v-55r, and 57r. Spaces were left for the Greek, which was added afterwards, probably in another hand. As a result there are various blank lines, notably 4 lines on 2v, the last 16 lines of 26v, the first 4 of 40r, 3 lines on 41v, the last line of 55r and the first 11 of 55v, and the last 3 on 57r. Folio 60 is blank except for "Andreias arcipiscopi colossensis" in the lower part of 60r. Throughout the dialogue, initials for Andreas, "C(olossensis)," are in blue and for Mark, "E(phesinus)," are in red. Initials 2 lines high are on fols. 2r (blue H), 2v (red C), 3r (blue D). 6r (red M), 7r (blue D), and 8r (red D), while sections of Greek text have two-line high initials in regular ink in the margins.

In the edition abbreviations are expanded tacitly, but the orthography of the manuscript is respected as well as the accentuation of the passages in Greek (except for the treatment of the grave accent before punctuation). Corrections are noted in the apparatus criticus. Concerning the Greek text, deviations from Petit's edition of Mark's letter as well as from the standard editions of the other texts quoted are also noted in the apparatus.

Dyalogus in Marcum, Ephesiorum pontificem, damnantem ritus et sacrificia Romane Ecclesie, habitus a fratre Andrea, archiepiscopo Colossensi, ad cives Methonenses

Andreas, archiepiscopus Colossensis, omnibus civibus Methonensibus Romanam fidem professis, salutem et vere beatitudinis assecutionem.

[1v] Plures sunt admodum dies quo quandam epistolam Ephesini heresiarche – si iis adhuc erroribus detinetur quibus se irretitum esse ostendit – plenam calumniis in Catholicam fidem tabellarius vestrum omnium nomine detulit. Ac summo studio postulavit ut blasphemii illius ineptiis responderem, affirmans vos magno desiderio affici audire a me quibus rationibus ipsi adversario fidei respondere habeatis. Et quamquam illud eorum | sit qui virtutibus et sapientia clarent, a quibus ego longissime absum, lesa nihilominus Catholica veritas et vestra devotio me ad scribendum impulerunt. Quod et dudum fecissem, sed febris que me hactenus torquet nec meditari nec quicquam litteris mandare permisit. Verum, ne vestra diuturna expectatio suo voto penitus frustrata videatur, artus et aurim longo fatiscences langore, ad opus venire coegi. Et licet longe plura ac meliora excogitari possent que illius indocti et temerarii hominis falsas argumentationes et a proposito penitus alienas refellerent, tenuissime tamen vires hec qualiacunque sint in presentiarum satis fore persuadent. Reliqua, si Deus me priori integritati restituet, ad aliud tempus differo.

[2r] Est igitur epistola Ephesini iniuriis ac mendatiis non mediocriter immixta. Et ut hec omnia vobis suo ordine innotescant, epistole parciuncule primo loco in propria voce ponentur. Ac propter eos qui non ita familiares sunt Greci sermonis, in Latinam dictionem vertemus. Deinde pro Latinis ac fide Catholica heresiarche calumniis – quantum Deus donaverit – respondebimus.

Inicio igitur epistole sacerdoti cuidam Georgio salutem optat, ita dicens:¹

[Ἐ]ντιμότατε πρεσβύτερε καὶ ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ ποθεινότατε ἀδελφὲ κύρη Γεώργιε· τοῦ Θεοῦ δέομαι ὅπως ὑγιαίνῃ² ἡ ἀγιωσύνη σου καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι καλῶς ἔχῃ³.

1 Marcus Eugenikos, *Epistola ad Georgium presbyterum* 1 (ed. Petit, 470, 13–16).

2 ὑγιαίνῃ] ὑγιαίνοι Petit

3 ἔχῃ] ἔχοι Petit

Honoratissime senior et nobis in Christo dilectissime frater domine Georgi, precor Deum ut sospes sit sanctitas tua.

Et post paucissima:⁴

[2v] Τὴν γραφὴν σου δεξάμενος λύπης οὐ φορητῆς ἐπληρώθη μαθὼν⁵ ἐξ αὐτῆς, ὅτι οἱ τὴν ἄζυμον καὶ νεκρὰν θυσίαν Ἰουδαϊκῶς ἱερουργοῦντες καὶ τῇ σκιᾷ τοῦ νόμου παρακαθήμενοι τολμῶσιν ἐγκαλεῖν ἡμῖν καὶ μέμφεσθαι περὶ τῶν ὑφ' ἡμῶν τελουμένων ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ λειτουργίᾳ, ἀγνοοῦντες οἱ ἄλανε, ἅτε ὑπὸ τοῦ τύφου τετυφλωμένοι, ὅτι πάντων | τῶν ὑφ' ἡμῶν τελουμένων καὶ γιγνομένων ἐγγράφους τὰς ἀποδείξεις ἔχομεν καὶ ὅτι κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἱεροῖς διδασκάλοις ἀκολουθοῦμεν καὶ ταῖς ἀποστολικαῖς ἀνωθεν παραδώσεσιν.

Cum suscepissem litteras tuas, intolerabili dolore impletus sum, edoctus per illas quo(d), qui azimum et mortuum sacrificium Iudaice offerentes et umbre legis assidentes, audeant nos accusare atque reprehendere, miseri illi nescii velut ipsa elacione obcecatis, ut eorum omnium que a nobis fiunt inscriptas demonstrationes habeamus. Nam in omnibus sacros doctores et veteres apostolorum traditiones sequimur.

[3r] Hec sunt Ephesini deliramenta in Romanam Ecclesiam. Si quid ex his que hic mentitur et ex aliis que postea addit de nulla alia Christianorum gente quam de Latinis intelligit. | Immoremur itaque paululum in hoc acervo iniuriarum, discutientes non solum sententias, sed ipsas – ut sic dixerim – sillabas. Ita enim facillime fiet ut ipsum indoctum ac iniquitate plenissimum ostendamus. Utque hoc iocundius fiat, fingamus nos ambos more Platonis coram omnium vestrum conventu considerare obiectantes alterutro ac respondentes. Sic enim apertior et suavior nostra disputatio fiet.

COLOSSENSIS: Dicas igitur mihi primo, Marce pontifex Ephesine, ymo corruptor Christiane religionis, cur Latinos accusas quod in azimo pane Deo sacrificium offerant? Nonne Salvator, volens suum corpus et sanguinem in memoriale sue perpetue karitatis relinquere solo pane absque fermento usus est? Nonne mox addidit:⁶ « Hoc facite in meam commemorationem »? Nec puto te ab illa tua solita quam pateris mentis alienatione amentiolem factum ut respondeas mihi aniles quorundam tuorum fabellas, quod eo sacrificandi articulo Dominus

4 Marcus Eugenicus, *Epistola ad Georgium presbyterum* 1 (ed. Petit, 470, 1–11).

5 ἐπληρώθη μαθὼν] ἐπληρώθημεναθὼν MS, sed v in μ emendato

6 Lc 22.19; 1 Cor 11.24.

panem | fermentatum in medium protulerit aut Pasca Iudeorum prevenerit. [3v]
 Quia ipsius Salvatoris testimonio non venerat ad solvendam, sed subeundam
 legem Mosaicam, sicut beatus Matheus evangelista scribit.⁷ Exinde, que tua
 ignavia est ut non intelligas quod proditor Filium Dei tanquam transgresso-
 rem legis publica voce accusasset, cum in ipsa frugalissima cena panem fer-
 mentarium in usum comedentium vidisset? Preterea, pontifices et populus
 Iudeorum magnum sermonem de templi everione aut Filii Dei appellatione [4r]
 non habuissent, cum illa sola panis transgressio aut preventio temporis ipsum
 ab Israhelitico populo delendum declarasset. Et si forte hec Salvatoris obser-
 vantia te in meliorem sensum non redigit, accedat Paulus illo suo ense acutis-
 sime veritatis cum ad Corinthios scriberet, qui te usque ad intima feriat:⁸

Ἐκκαθάρατε οὖν τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην, ἵνα ᾗτε νέον φύραμα, καθὼς ἐστὲ ἄζυμοι·
 καὶ γὰρ | τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός, ὥστε ἐορτάζωμεν⁹ μὴ ἐν
 ζύμῃ παλαιᾷ μηδὲ ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας, ἀλλ' ἐν ἄζυμοις εἰλικρινείας¹⁰
 καὶ ἀληθείας.

Expurgate, inquit, vetus fermentum ut sitis nova conspersio, sicut estis
 azimi. Etenim Pasca nostrum immolatus est Christus. Epulemur itaque,
 non in fermento malitie et nequitie, sed in azimis sinceritatis et
 veritatis.

Quid dicis ad hec, doctissime Marce? Nonne tibi videtur ducem Christiane reli-
 gionis fermentum reprobasse atque utrumque conferendo a finibus Christianis
 depulisse, azima vero tanquam veriora et nitidiora fidelibus sumenda prece-
 pisse? Utque doceat te quid de hac nostra disputatione intelligat, de immo-
 latione Christi memoravit. “Etenim Pasca nostrum,” inquit, “immolatus est
 Christus,” quam immolationem¹¹ Latini iugi sacrificio nuntiant. Cum igitur
 idem Paulus Catholice veritatis summus preceptor sit, si ille ipsa sua clarissima
 sententia te ab illo profundissimo limo erroris non edu|xerit, eterna cecitate [4v]
 ferieris.

Et ne forte percussus in capite hac clava invictissime veritatis velut colu-
 ber in orbes volutus diffugas, ecce apertissima ratio que te in angustissimum
 angulum venando deducet, ut quorsum evadere velis minime habeas. Dicas,

7 Mt 5.17.

8 1 Cor 5.7–8.

9 ἐορτάζωμεν] ἐορτάζομεν MS

10 εἰλικρινείας] εἰλικρινίας MS

11 immolationem] immolalationem MS

obsecro, Ephesine, cum Paulus fidei doctor azimorum usum nobis precipiat, intelligitne hoc iuxta littere observantiam, aut alia quadam alciore et spirituali significatione, vel complectendo velit utrumque a nobis celebrari? Quarta enim participio in hac intelligentia inveniri minime potest. Si iuxta littere significationem doctor gentium iubet ut azimis in immolatione Christi uti debeamus, qua fronte, indoctissime hominum, audes Latinos carpere quod in fermento Deo sacrificium non offerant, nisi simul velis sicut obstinatissimus homo et Pauli doctrinam spernere atque abiicere?

[5r] Si vero dixeris illam Apostoli preceptionem non litterali, sed mistica quadam intelligentia esse accipiendam, nec hoc te tutari potest ut tuam ignaviam simul | atque iniquitatem celes. Nam azima Latinorum et fermentata tua tanquam typica et ymaginaria ad illa spiritualia et prototypa adduci necesse est, et, ut tuo exemplo utar,¹² tanquam ymago regis ad ipsum vivum et verissimum regem. Audi itaque, Ephesine, insolubilem tibi argumentationem: quemadmodum se spectant prototypa et simbola azimorum et fermentorum dignitate et excellentia, sic et typi et eorum similitudines conferri debent. Sed iam Paulus, equissimus iudex, prototypa azimorum simbolis fermentorum pretulit, dicens: « Epulemur igitur non in fermento malitie et nequitie, sed in azimis sinceritatis et veritatis. » Ergo et azima Latinorum qui eorum spiritualium typi sunt, fermentariis tuis longissime prestant. Hanc rationem, Ephesine pontifex, inficiari non potes. Relictus es igitur in ultima parte propositae nostre particionis, in qua te ipsum etiam sine vincente victum fateberis. Si doctor gentium utrumque complexus est ut et typos et eorum simbola simul veneremur, ipsa tua vox te [5v] dampnat | et iniuste Romanam Ecclesiam calumniatum indicat.

Fatearis itaque errorem tuum, Ephesine pater, et te iniuste Latinos accusasse agnoscas. Si autem victus propria voce hoc facere neglexeris, coniectis in terram oculis eterno rubore perfunderis. Nec ego tibi hec obiiecto ut panem tuum fermentarium reprobem et sacrificio Christiano penitus interdicam. Nam cum fermentum et azimum solam quandam differentiam accidentis habeant, cum panis speciem mutare nequeant, si panem triticeum dederis, sive azimus aut fermentarius fuerit, dum relique alie partes sacrificii cum dignitate maneant, iure Deo hostiam immolabis. Sed cum Latini Christi institutionem, apostolorum observantiam, Pauli preceptionem, vetustissimum Ecclesie Catholice morem in testes fidelissimos habeant, tu quos defensores affers qui his nostris audeant comparari? Nisi forte velis a Iudeis mutuum postulare, quo tuam iniquitatem defendas? Consuetudinem autem tuorum Orientalium unde ortum [6r] acceperit iam inferiori | disputatione Leo pontifex maximus declarabit. Si igitur Romana Ecclesia materna pietate modestissime ac sapientissime tuum

12 Cf. Greek text fol. 25r (βασιλεὺς λέγεται καὶ ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰκὼν καὶ τιμᾶται καὶ προσκυνεῖται).

fermentum receptat, cur tu oblitus ipsius pietate ei calumniam inferis? Et de tua prima iniuria nunc usque dixisse sufficiat. Nunc ad secundam ineptissimam tuam dictionem veniamus.

Mortuum sacrificium Latinorum nominas. Ego puto te adeo his tuis erroribus captum ut etiam loquens propriam vocem ignores. Mortuum vocas sacrificium Romane Ecclesie. Ergo ipsum vivum aliquando fuisse necesse est. Nemo Grecorum audiens (« νεκρόν »)¹³ secundum Grecum, aut « mortuum » iuxta Latinam vocem, mox vivum¹⁴ quodpiam non intelligat quod aliquando vixerit. Si igitur Latini nunc hostiam mortuam Deo omnipotenti offerunt, aliquo tempore hanc eandem hostiam vixisse oportet. Doce itaque nos, Ephesine doctor, quando vivebat et quo pacto illud mori contigerit.¹⁵

EPHESINUS: Dico tunc Romanum sacrificium vivum fuisse cum panem | [6v] fermento mixtum offerri consueverat.

(COLOSSENSIS): Sed hanc tuam ignaviam Leo, sanctissimus Romanus pontifex, quem tu etiam columnam fidei nominas, dilluit, affirmans ab initio sacerdotalis officii totam Dei Ecclesiam azimum optulisse.¹⁶ Sed cum Ebion omnia legalia simul cum evangelicis preceptis debere servari contenderet, statuerunt patres ab illo sacrificandi genere abstinere donec illa hereticorum rabies evanesceret, deinde in priorem observantiam redire. Quod et actum est, Grecis in usu fermentario perseverantibus. Cum itaque priori tempore tota Dei Ecclesia in azimo conficiens vivum sacrificium offerre consueverat, cur Romana Ecclesia vetustissimum institutum servans nunc mortuam oblationem Deo immolat? Quis adeo desipit ut hoc non intelligat? Ceterum, Ephesine, ignorare non habes ut que non per se, sed casu ac dispensatione admissa sunt, in generalem institutionem venire non habent. Deinde, que ratio te impellit ut fermento animam, farine | corpus attribuas, maxime cum illa vivificet, hoc [7r] in corruptionem deducat? Anima per se vivit; fermentum corruptum est. Si enim ipsum prius corrumpi non contingeret, inde panem fermentarum non haberes. Huius experimentum constat. Nam si diu in massa fermentum latuerit, ipsam totam corrumpit, unde et acescere incipit, quod philosophorum ac medicorum sententia ex corruptione evenit. Hec igitur tua argumentatio quantum valeat vides. Si itaque veriolem habes, illam proferas, obsecro. Sed

13 *lac.* MS (the Greek was never filled in)

14 *vivum*] *unum* MS

15 *illud mori*] *mori illud a.c.* MS

16 The story of Pope Leo I and the Ebionites appears to be apocryphal, with origins in the early thirteenth century; see Schabel, "The Quarrel over Unleavened Bread," 115–122.

quia video te nullam digniorem habere, ad aliam tuam mendacissimam dictionem accedamus.

Dicis Latinos Iudaice sacrificium Deo offerre. Vellem abste scire, quid est Iudaice sacris inservire? Sic enim ad tue corruptissime vocis damnationem citius veniemus.

EPHESINUS: Tunc Iudaice quempiam sacerdotum celebrare intelligo, cum in ipsa sua oblatione legalibus utitur.

[7v] COLOSSENSIS: Video te sic vehementer obtusum ut veriore[m] atque acutior[em] rationem dare nequeas. Audi itaque, | Ephesine, ut hoc tuo responso te victum fatearis. Si is Iudaice immolat qui in ipso sacrificandi articulo legalibus utitur, cum tu itidem facias, os tuum te apertissime damnat.

EPHESINUS: Nunquam me quicquam Iudeorum observare ostendes.

COLOSSENSIS: Nonne inter sacrificandum panem fermentarium offers? Et neminem rite corpus Salvatoris conficere posse clamas, si eo pane usus non fuerit? Nam ignorare non habes preceptum illud Leviticum quo Deus Iudeis iusserat duodecim panes fermentatos munus primiciarum semper mense propositionis apponi debere.¹⁷ Ex hoc ergo invenies non minus te Iudaice sacramenta celebrare quam illi quos iniuste accusas. Immo, rem dicam incredibilem tibi, verissimam tamen: ritus sacrificii tui Iudaismo longe coniunctior est ac diuturnior. Si quidem legale quo Latinus utitur semel in anno ab Israhelitico populo solenne habebatur, quod vero tu sequeris perpetua veneratione habitum est. Nunquam enim mense propositionis panis fermento immixtus defuit.

[8r] Collige igitur | omnia hec et in unum aliquod redige et invenies te insipienter Latinos accusasse. Sed quo Iudaismus te deduxerit iam intelligis. Videamus quid umbra legis tecum actura sit.

Dicis Romanam Ecclesiam umbre Mosaice institutionis assidere. Vellem primo abste scire que ista legis umbra est. Eius enim diffinitione cognita, facile intelligemus si Romana Ecclesia legalibus assidet.

EPHESINUS: Observationem legalium ideo umbram nomino quia, quemadmodum radius corporis luminosi occurrens posterius denso atque opaco reflectitur et ante obiectum umbram generat donec lumen incessu rectilineo illud inspiciat, sic et sol iustitie oriens, per signa et prophetias patribus illis ostensa, radium legis in corpus durissimum Iudeorum traiecerat, qui in adversam partem reflexus, quia gratia per Ihesum Christum dumtaxat effusa est, umbram solam ante oculos Iudeorum reliquit significantem aliquando illum in corpus

17 Lv 2.11–12, 7.13–14, 24.5–6.

opacum perventurum, qui priscis oraculis nunciabatur. Hec intellexit acute qui | ait:¹⁸ "Surge illuminare Iherusalem, quia venit lumen tuum." [8v]

COLOSSENSIS: Recte respondisti, et hoc tuum quottidianum exemplum satis apte accedit atque utinam in ceteris ita sentires. Nulla enim inter nos concertatio intercederet, sed una esset nobis de fide Christiana opinio. Sed queso ut me ultro doceas unde ex hac umbre proprietate ostendis Latinos umbre legali intendere.

EPHESINUS: Cum quis legalibus preceptis utitur, quid aliud quam umbre legali deservit?

COLOSSENSIS: Falleris, Ephesine. Et quia paulo ante te docte respondisse putavi, me ipsum errasse profiteor. Nam si aliud eruditius non addideris, te ipsum umbre Mosaice servire fateberis.

EPHESINUS: Quo pacto ad illud prophanissimum deduci possum?

COLOSSENSIS: Quia cum panis fermentarius in mensa propositionis prorsus legalis fuerit, quem tu sacrificas, pluraque alia servare teneris que lege Mosaica precepta sunt, quid aliud deest nisi ut te ipsum cum Iudeorum turba in umbra mortifere legis colloques?

EPHESINUS: Video profecto non omnia Mosaice legis esse abiicienda, | sed [9r] quedam cum evangelicis preceptis convenire.

COLOSSENSIS: Hec tua responsio, Ephesine, plurimum veritatis habet, sed Latinos umbre legis intendere nondum docuit. Imo ipsos ab illo crimine alienos significat, cum dicas quedam legalium non umbram Christianis populis facere. Indica igitur, obsecro, ea que nobis salutaria sunt et que perniciem inferunt ut a te eruditiores facti superstitionem Iudaicam evitemus.

EPHESINUS: Iustissime petis; legalia que cultum Deo afferunt sine offensione veneranda sunt. Quis enim adeo mente alienus est qui dicat Deum non esse semper adorandum et summa religione colendum? Que vero (spectant) ad memoriam beneficiorum quibus Iudeos ornaverant aut que ipsis promiserat, illa servare minime expedit.

COLOSSENSIS: Ratio quam affers, cum ad sui integritatem plurimis egeat, tum et Latinos ab umbra Iudeorum omnino alienos ostendit. Nam sacrificium quod Romana Ecclesia in azimis offert non pro ereptione Egipciace servitutis aut sponsione eorum que Iudei futura sibi arbitrantur | adorandum ostenditur, [9v] sed quia cum illis sensibilibus speciebus non figura aut aliquo simbolo, sed presentia corporis adest is qui de Virgine natus est, passus, mortuus, resuscitatus, ascendens in celum, sedet ad dexteram Patris, ideo ipsum Romana Ecclesia adorandum populis Christianis congruis cerimoniais offert. Hec igitur

18 Is 60.1.

tua legalium differentia numquam Latinos Iudaice umbre studuisse docebit. Cumque ii tui sermones ostendant te prorsus nil integri sanique de legalium cultu sentire, patiaris me paululum te longius alloqui ut vel scias quod ante te audire non contigit, aut mente repetas quod a memoria tua lapsum est.

EPHESINUS: Vellem te tantum in hac religiosissima discussione edissere(re) quantum ego cupio audire, si modo adversus iis¹⁹ que sentio non dixeris.

[10r] COLOSSENSIS: Cum ad eterne beatitudinis participationem homo creatus fuisse videatur, ad illud felicissimum munus attingere minime potuit, nisi prius Deum coleret atque amaret. Sed amor Dei proximique dilectio | adeo sibi ipsis vicina sunt ut alterum sine altero vera caritas dici non possit. Ad hanc igitur amicitiam nanciscendam data sunt precepta moralia, que collecta in denarium numerum surgunt. Ea enim rite servata vehementer alterutram karitatem accendunt. Verum, cum ipsa in iure nature, quod indefinitum atque effusum est, tanquam in propria sede locata sint, egebant aliqua definita ratione ut que immixta confusaque tenebant, explicata et in partes divisa hominibus traderentur. Propterea cerimonialia ipsis addiecta sunt quibusdam religiosis observantiis designata ut reverentiam Deo cultumque afferrent. Addita sunt et iudicialia quibus conciliate invicem hominum mentes mutuam karitatem servarent. Hac ratione patres nostre religionis inducti preceptorum legalium summam tripartitam esse voluerunt.

[10v] EPHESINUS: Ignota mihi dicis et tibi ipsi adversari videris. Nam si ad amicitiam Dei proximique necessitudinem coniungendam precepta moralia mentem hominis vehementer inflamant, | quid necesse erat aliam partitionem intelligere? Si vero ad legis observantiam illa opportuna est, profecto ad cultum Dei pacemque humanam precepta moris non vehementer accendunt. Considera igitur quo te tua responsio duxit.

COLOSSENSIS: Si que dico tibi ignota sunt nescio. Unum mihi notissimum habeo: ut illa mee partitionis ratio nullam sibi repugnantiam parit, quod ut tibi ostendam, necesse est ut ultro audias. Cum homo ex anima et corpore simul constet, que a Deo creationis beneficio data sunt, oportet eorum quodlibet in gratiarum reminiscentiam cultum Deo offerre. Non igitur satis est hominis officio, cum solo intellectu et affectu Deum observantissime colat, si corpus iuxta mentis devocionem ipsi honorem non afferat. Plurimum enim illa que exteriori corporis gestu aguntur mentem humanam excitant, si modo modeste ac rite fiant. Que omnia, cum in preceptis Decalogi enumerata non sint, oportuit alia addere, que 'cerimonialia' appellamus.

EPHESINUS: Assentior.

[11r] COLOSSENSIS: | Pari ratione et de iudicialibus dictum invenies. Nam cum in multitudine hominum modesti inveniantur qui cognita veritate sine coactore

19 iis] sic MS

virtutem sequuntur, et corrupti que non nisi impulsu penarum ad studium veritatis accedunt, dignum fuit primo utrisque precepta virtutum ostendere. Et ut perditorum audacie occurreretur tutaque esset inter eos vita bonorum, irrogate sunt pene, quas infligi debere iudicialia precepta iusserunt.

EPHESINUS: Hec tua ratio, et si plurimum mihi suadeat, non tamen ad illud me duxit ut intelligam que eorum vos ab umbra legali tutantur et que admissa Iudaice superstitionis participes faciunt.

COLOSSENSIS: Faciam libenti animo, si que dixerō docte suscipias. Tenes memoria que superiori loco probata sunt, mortalium scilicet genus ad participationem eterne felicitatis fuisse generatum.

EPHESINUS: Et maxime.

COLOSSENSIS: Cum itaque in eterno illo consilio – ut sic dixerim – post iacturam hominis iter ad superos esset invium interdictumque donec e celo unus quispiam pontifex maximus adventaret qui sanguine suo aditum illum patefaceret, erat decentissimum ceremonias veteris institutionis et cultum Deo tribuere et conciliatorem tanti operis quibusdam figuris ac tenuissimis enigmatibus futurum nuntiare. Cumque Iudei futurum dicant quem iam impleto officio preterisse et ad paterna regna redisse apertissimis testimoniis constat, illi ceremoniali umbre assident, nos veritatem profiteamur. Unde et nobis nulla prorsus umbra relicta est, sed sola lucis ymago. Sunt igitur ille (umbra) post evangelice legis promulgationem fugiende tanquam letifera. [11v]

EPHESINUS: Putabam me a te hodie aliquid auditurum quod et suspensum dimitteret et te doctiorem arbitrarer. Utrumque autem horum hec tua ratio diluit.

COLOSSENSIS: Quo pacto hec duo sibi coniuncta sunt?

EPHESINUS: Collectis in unum argumentationibus tuis, illud te velle intelligo ut veteres sacrificiorum institutiones et cultum Deo attulerint | significaverintque venturum quem nos preterisse indubitata fide tenemus. Oportuit igitur vel utrumque tolli vel neutrum abici. [12r]

COLOSSENSIS: Neutrum horum me in illam inextricabilem errorum silvam deducit. Nam alterutra ista ita sibi seiuncta sunt ut, cum cultum afferas, nulla necessitas persuadeat venturum esse quem iam futurum legales observantie predicant. Quid enim necesse est venturum illum nuntiare quem implevisse officium et sacrificio semper nobis adesse credimus? Cultus igitur divinus mansit pro rerum temporumque varietate. Cumque Iudeorum populus cecitate obductus in umbra legali sedeat, est futuri expectatione sollicitus.

EPHESINUS: Video te vera loqui, quibus contradicere nequeo. Sed unum mihi dumtaxat disseras, si velis me tandem a diuturna illa expectatione absolvere.

COLOSSENSIS: Vellem hec que diximus te tanta pietate fidei credere quam ego oblector in hac dignissima disceptatione commorari.

[12v] EPHEVINUS: Quo pacto | cultus priscorum apud institutionem evangeli-
cam integer invenitur?

COLOSSENSIS: Diximus Christum velud verissimum pontificem proprio sanguine celi ianuam apperuisse. Cum enim se suavissimam hostiam Patri obtulerit, eius iram placavit, adscivitque hominem ad sui conciliationem quem iam tot labentibus annis depulsum habuerat. Ipso itaque sacrificante longe sanctius atque salubrius pontificii dignitas a veteri preceptione in aliam digniorem observantiam traducta est, eo pacto ut et ipsum sacrificium aliis cerimoniais celebretur. Translato enim sacerdotio, oportuit et sacrificium transferri, sicut Paulus Hebreis scripserat.²⁰

EPHEVINUS: Quia Pauli sententiam negare non possum, cogor et tuas argumentationes admittere. Unum nihilominus deest, quo agnito, sentiam an recte tibi illa concesserim.

COLOSSENSIS: Quid est quod adhuc te sollicitat?

EPHEVINUS: Que sunt ille celebritates ad quas cultus veteris institutionis translatus integer mansit?

[13r] COLOSSENSIS: Ego omnia illa tibi enumerarem. Sed cum ad alia, ut vi|des, festinem, pauca nunciabo, ex quibus reliqua facile intelliges. Inter ceteras observationes divine maiestatis sacrificia et sacramenta precipua habita sunt, cum prima ad ipsum Deum placandum venerandumque instituta sint, alia ad ministrorum sanctificationem. Utraque autem post evangelice legis predicationem in sacratiores observantias adacta sunt. Cumque omnium veterum sacrificiorum nullum huic nostro comparari possit – pontifex enim noster et hostia quam offert itidem sunt; preterea nobis ille presentia corporis adest, qui iter ad superos ostendit et illud facile fecit – ideo omnes figuras illas et sacrificia complevit, et cerimoniais modestioribus atque sanctionibus celebrari precepit. Hic est panis ac vinum quod Melchisedech in illa superiori etate obtulerat,²¹ hic pro effectu suo mirifico quem fidelibus affert, manne e celo Iudeis destinato aptissime confertur. Quod autem semel passus est eterna redemptione inventa festum expiationis enunciat. Et quia | sua sanctissima passione genus hominum a dyabolica potestate eripuit, illi se agno pascali rectissime coaptavit. Hic vitulus oblatus propter summam potentiam. Hic Aries quia dux omnium qui celestia regna penetrarunt aut penetraturi sunt. Hic Hyrcus quia in similitudinem carnis peccati nobis apparuit. In hoc vitela rufa finem accepit, cum naturam assumptam passioni exposuit. Vides quam divine omnia sacrificiorum genera in hoc unum convenerint? De sacramentis etiam, si recte perspexeris, idem invenies. Nam sacramento circumcisionis baptisma succes-

[13v]

20 Hbr 7.12.

21 Gn 14.18.

sit, esui agni pascalis oblatio que in altari sumitur, purificationibus Iudeorum penitentie sacramentum, consecrationi pontificum sacer ordo designatus est.

EPHESINUS: Rectissime veteribus novas ceremonias coaptasti. Sed vehementer admiror cur confirmationem et extremam hominum unctionem, matrimonium quoque sola reliqueris.

COLOSSENSIS: De his etiam certum te faciam, si modo vim horum prius consideraveris. Nam cum confirmatio apostolica institu|tione plenitudinem [14r] gratie signet, quam Mosaica lex non contulit, hoc sacramentum figura nulla precessit. Extrema quoque linicio cum ad preparamentum aditus vite eterne data sit, qui nondum in veteribus cerimoniis patuerat, lex illa hanc expiacionem silendo preteriit. Matrimonium insuper, quia apud Hebreos solo nature officio celebratur, non sacramenti veneratione, que in coniunctione Christi et Ecclesie constare dignoscitur, nihil habuit vetus preceptio quo illud indicasset. Vides quantum illa tua de umbra legali calumnia temporis sermonisque consumpsit?

Sed quia clarissime visum est numquam Romanam Ecclesiam umbre legis assedissee, de inani et falsissima tua iactatione sermo habendus est. Dicis te in omnibus tuis observationibus sanctorum patrum atque apostolorum traditionem secutum.

EPHESINUS: Dixi et constanter affirmo.

COLOSSENSIS: Quo pacto patres Christiane religionis sequeris, cum Domino et Salvatori nostro aptissime contradicas? Quis Catholice veritatis prece|ptor [14v] te suo contubernio aggregabit, quem novit totius Christiane fidei adversarium? Tu omnia iura naturalia atque divina pervertis. Tu Filio Dei dignitatem adimis. Tu totam divinitatem exha(u)ris et in nihilum ducis. Tu infinitam deitatum turbam aggregas et ipso Deo trino et uno longe prestantiorem facis.

EPHESINUS: Que sunt illa figmenta que iniustissime adversum me iactitas?

COLOSSENSIS: Nulla conditione ab hac palestra discedam, si non prius que dixi vera ostendero. Et primo a te cupio scire si Filius Dei cum Patre Spiritum Sanctum producat.

EPHESINUS: Nequaquam. Essent enim in deitate duo principia, quod ab omni theologia alienum est.

COLOSSENSIS: Ecce iam ante limen tuus maximus error. Ecce summa ignavia. Que philosophia te docet ad numerum suppositorum agentium multitudinem quoque principiorum designari? Nam si trium ignium una esset caliditas que in aliquid susceptivum ageret, iam non tres calefactiones²² aut tria principia, sed unam accionem unumque principium esse a sapientibus traditum est. Preterea, | vellem hanc novam theologiam ab ore tuo audire. Quid est quod, [15r]

22 calefactiones] calefactiones a.c. MS

cum in productione totius divini opificii trinus ille Deus annuisset, non tria principia dicas, sed unum dumtaxat; spirando autem Spiritum mox Patrem et Filium duo principia obicis?

EPHESINUS: Potestas enim creandi, cum ad essentiam attineat, tum tribus illis personis communis est. Vis vero spirandi iam non ad essentiam, sed ad solam personam Patris spectare videtur, velut illi proprietas personalis. Et ideo in processione officio non habet Filius cui communicet.

COLOSSENSIS: Si potestas spirandi Patris personalis proprietas est, sicut tu false existimas, necesse est: aut constituat vel distinguat sive utrumque faciat.

EPHESINUS: Constituit paternam ypostasim.

[15v] COLOSSENSIS: Quid constitui oportet quod nature ordine constitutum preintelligitur? Nam cum mediacione Filii Patrem Spiritum producere Catholici patres affirmant, qui iam per paternitatem constitutus creditur. Quid necesse est ipsi aliud principium constitutum querere? Preterea, docere cogis quo ordine ille due proprietates | sese complectuntur. Illud etiam effugere non potes ut unam ad alteram potentiam receptivam dicere non habeas. Et alia quam plura illi summe maiestati incongruentia ex hac tua rudi theologia emergunt, que enumerare disputatio presens non patitur.

EPHESINUS: Fortassis tutius est a spiratione constitutionis proprietatem adimere.

COLOSSENSIS: Immo necessarium, si illam summam essentiam simplicissimam velis fateri. Quid igitur spirationi in deitate negotii est?

EPHESINUS: Ut distinguat.²³

COLOSSENSIS: Que?

EPHESINUS: Patrem et Spiritum.

COLOSSENSIS: De Filii vero distinctione ad eundem Spiritum quid arbitraris?

EPHESINUS: Ego nihil aliud credo quam beatissimus Iustinus me docuit, dicens:²⁴ "Sicut Filius ex Patre, ita et Spiritus, solo modo existencie differentes," ut "ille²⁵ scilicet filiali," sicut Gregorius Theologus ait,²⁶ "Hic vero spirali modo procedat."

COLOSSENSIS: Hii modi se ipsis differunt, vel est illic aliud quod ipsos distinctos faciat?

23 distinguat] destinguat MS

24 Pseudo-Iustinus Martyr, *Expositio de recta confessione sive de sancta consubstantiali Trinitate*, ed. Frederic Morel (Paris: Sébastien Cramoisy, 1636), 380C: ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, οὕτως καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα πλήν γε δὴ τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς ὑπάρξεως διοίσει.

25 ille] illi a.c. MS

26 locum Gregorii Nazianzeni non invenimus

EPHESINUS: Aliud quoddam, ut scilicet generatio vel genitum Patri immediatum sit, processio vero aut spiratus esse quod habet | per Filium eterna proprietate accepit. [16r]

COLOSSENSIS: Sed cum medium nature et artis in hoc distare videatur, ut nature quidem medium conferat esse extremo, presertim in eadem essentia, sicut constat in nature operibus, quod cause aut principii signum est, negare non potes, Ephesine, vim spirationis inesse Filio. Quod tamen temere negabas. Vade igitur et aliam saniores doctrinam disce. Postea rediens, poteris de his rectius iudicare. Sed lesa a te Filii dignitas nos ad alias tuas blasphemias confutandas accedere iubet. Ipse per Iohannem evangelistam testatur dicens:²⁷ "Omnia que Pater habet mea sunt." Pater autem cum habeat spirare Spiritum Sanctum, oportet ut itidem et Filius habeat.

EPHESINUS: Si quod primo dixisti verum est, tunc et Filius Pater est, quod Sabelii heresis predicat.

COLOSSENSIS: Illa vox Salvatoris est: "Omnia," inquit, "que habet Pater mea sunt." Quod si id negare ausus fueris, mox probabis quod dixeram, ut scilicet et Verbo divino et summe Veritati adverseris. Id autem quod falsissimum intulisti, ut Filius Pater | sit, summa illa sapientia in caput tuum retorquet. [16v] Nam cum 'Patrem' nominaverat, iam ipsum aliam personam a se distinctam ostendit. Hoc paucissimis Gregorius Theologus tuus complexus est:²⁸ "Omnia," inquit, "Patri et Filio communia sunt, preter in(n)ascibilitatem et genitu(r)a(m), quorum primum Patri, aliud Filio, fides Chatholica tribuit." Eadem etiam Veritas in alio evangelii loco te sibi contrarium indicat:²⁹ "Cum venerit," inquit, "ille Spiritus Veritatis, qui a Patre procedit, ipse docebit vos omnia." 'Spiritum Veritatis' ait que Veritas ipse est: "Sum," inquit, "via, veritas, et vita."

EPHESINUS: Cum me errare ostendere vis, te ipsum in errorem deducis. Illa siquidem Salvatoris sententia non a se, sed a Patre Spiritum Sanctum procedere docet, quod aperte profiteamur.

COLOSSENSIS: Cum Spiritum a Patre procedere credis, nullus Latinorum te accusat. Sed cum a Patre solo id esse asseris, mox in Arrianam blasphemiam incidis. Nec mirari habes si Filius processionem Patri attribuat. Solet enim omnia sua illi tanquam fonti totius deitatis ascribere, ut est illud:³⁰ "Mea doctrina non | est mea, sed eius qui me misit," Patris. Utque barathrum [17r] tuorum errorum aperiam, peto ut mihi respondeas: cum post resurrectionem

²⁷ Io 16.15.

²⁸ locum Gregorii Nazianzeni non invenimus

²⁹ Io 15.26, 14.26, 14.6.

³⁰ Io 7.16.

suam sufflaverat in discipulos, dicens:³¹ “Accipite Spiritum Sanctum,” quis Spiritus fuerat ille, ipsene de quo nobis sermo est, vel aliud quodpiam?

EPHESINUS: Aliud donum sive energia Spiritus, nec solum illud, sed infinita eiuscemodi munera, cum Patre communia habet, eterna et increata, inter se varia et ab ipso Deo trino et uno re essentiaque distincta.

COLOSSENSIS: Habentne in se realis entitatis existentiam?

EPHESINUS: Habent.

COLOSSENSIS: Si in se non intellectus fabricatione, sed ex ipsa nature proprietate et essentia distant, cogeris ipsa aut substantias aut accidentia appellare.

EPHESINUS: Neutrum horum habent.

COLOSSENSIS: Ens in omnes rerum naturas diffusum in substantiam et accidens partitionem accepit. Quam si cui substuleris, et rationem entitatis illi auferre necesse est. Si igitur ipsa deitatis munera entia arbitraris, substantie aut accidentia sunt.

[17v] EPHESINUS: Nunquam illas deitates coeternas | divine Trinitati in substantie et accidentis divisione concludam.

COLOSSENSIS: Suntne in se aut in alio herentia quedam? Si in se, hoc est substantie dignitas. Si in alio, et actu iam sunt, necesse est illa accidentis rationem habere.

EPHESINUS: Nulla esse poterit argumentatio que me ab hac opinione evellat.

[18r] COLOSSENSIS: Intellige igitur, Ephesiorum pontifex, si que dixi digna tue admissioni non ducis, impelleris omnia naturalia iura pervertere. Nam tante amplitudinis et dignitatis illa particio est ut, cum ille opifex Deus omnes rerum naturas et entitates in illa concluderet, tum passus non est – quemadmodum quidam theologorum aiunt – ab ipsa ent(it)atis divisione disiungi, sed ad substantiam se contulit tanquam principium et actor sue sapientissime fabricationis. Vides quo pacto ille tuus pestilens error ordinem nature evertat? Fatearis ergo in illo sensibili flatu Salvatorem discipulis Spiritum Sanctum dedisse ut potestatem remittendi peccata haberent, quem in Pente|costes expectatione mirifica quadam maiestate in linguis igneis misit, ut preceptores fierent et omnia linguarum genera loquerentur. Quod si facere nolueris, totam universi constitutionem et fabricam adversus te irritabis. Utque plane videas quantum divine magestati et magis quam Lucifer adverseris, responde huic questioni: Dei sapientia, potentia, intellectus, voluntas, vita, et cetera que ‘perfectiones’ Latini in Deo, tu vero ‘energias’ nominas, suntne inter se idem habentque cum divina natura entitatem communem, vel re ipsa et ratione distincta?

31 Io 20.22.

EPHESINUS: Distincta in re³² penitus et ab ea diversa.

COLOSSENSIS: Que, obsecro, ratio aut que disciplina te ad hanc extremam infidelitatem³³ deduxit?

EPHESINUS: Non blasphemia, sicut tu clamitas, sed doctrina certe patrum quibus tu et venerationem et fidem dare teneris:³⁴

Καὶ πρῶτον μὲν πάρεστιν ὁ μέγας καὶ μακάριος Διονύσιος ἐν τῷ περὶ ἡνωμένης καὶ διακεκριμένης | θεολογίας βιβλίῳ πολλὰς ἡμῖν διαφορὰς διδοὺς οὐσίας τέ [18v]
καὶ προσδὼν, τὸ τὴν μὲν εἶναι κρύφιον καὶ ἄγνωστον, τὰς δὲ γνωρίμους καὶ καταφανεῖς, καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀμέθεκτον, τὰς δὲ μεθεκτάς, καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀνώνυμον, τὰς δ' ὀνομασμένας, καὶ τὴν μὲν ὑπερκεῖσθαι, τὰς δὲ ὑφείσθαι, καὶ τὴν μὲν εἶναι μίαν, τὰς δὲ πολλὰς, καὶ τὴν μὲν εἶναι αἰτίαν, τὰς δ' αἰτιατάς.

Et primo quidem adest beatissimus Dionisius, cum de unione et discretionem theologie disputaret. Quo in loco divinam essentiam occultam et incognitam nobis, suas vero energias cognitac ac manifestas esse affirmat, illam imparticipabilem, has participabiles, illam innominabilem, has suis nominibus appellari, et illam unam, has plures, illam causam, has causata(s), illam preesse, has subici.

Et Damascenus, quem tu negare non potes:³⁵ | [19r]

[“Ε]ργον³⁶ μὲν τῆς θείας φύσεως ἐστὶν ἡ προαιώνιος καὶ αἰδὶος γέννησις. ἔργον δὲ τῆς θείας θελήσεως ἡ κτίσις. “Ετι φησὶν ὁ Θεολόγος Γρηγόριος· «ἄλλο γεννῶν καὶ γέννησις, θέλων καὶ θέλησις, λέγων καὶ λόγος, εἰ μὴ μεθύομεν».

sic dicit: ‘Opus quidem divine nature ante eternitatem sempiterna generatio; divine autem voluntatis opus ipsa creatura.’ Item, Gregorius

32 re] se MS

33 infidelitatem] infidelitatem MS

34 Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, *De divinis nominibus*, e.g., II, cc. 2 et 4 (ed. Beate Regina Suchla [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990] 125, 7 et 126, 3–13).

35 Cf. Iohannes Damascenus, *Expositio fidei* 8, 67–72 (ed. Bonifatius Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos II “Εκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως–Expositio Fidei, Patristische Texte und Studien 12* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1973], 21: ἡ μὲν γέννησις ἀναρχος καὶ αἰδὶος φύσεως ἔργον οὐσα... ἡ δὲ κτίσις ἐπὶ θεοῦ θελήσεως ἔργον οὐσα...); Cf. Gregorius Nazianzenus, *Oratio* 29 (De Filio), 6, 26–27 (ed. Paul Gallay, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27–31 (Discours théologiques), Sources Chrétiennes 250* [Paris: Cerf, 1978]: ἀλλ’ ἕτερον ἐστὶν, οἶμαι, θέλων καὶ θέλησις, γεννῶν καὶ γέννησις, λέγων καὶ λόγος, εἰ μὴ μεθύομεν).

36 First letter missing; cf. quotation 1.

Theologus: 'Aliud generans et aliud generatio, volens et voluntas, dicens et sermo, nisi ebrii simus.'

Quid dicis ad hec, Colossensis? Negare audebis hec tria Ecclesiae lumina?

[19v] COLOSSENSIS: Minime. Sed quo pacto hi sanctissimi patres hec senserint patebit omnino, si prius extreme infidelitatis te arguam. Si Deus sua essentia non sapiens, non potens, non intelligens, non vivens est, sed aliunde hoc suscipit, nullam perfectionem illi summe simplicissimeque nature ex se in esse fateberis. Et cum illa deitatum genera, que tu impudentissime fingis, per se sapientia, potentia, intellectus, et vita | sint, necesse est illam infinitam turbam longe prestantiorem esse hoc uno Deo, cui illa tot munera donant. Et cum tu illud immensum infinitumque entitatis pelagus, secundum theologum Nazanzenum,³⁷ in infinita superstitiosa vascula evacuaveris, non habebit quo omnibus entibus ipsum esse diffundat. Ha, infidelissime et omnium prischorum gentilium longe deterior! Ipsi enim ob excellentiam aut beneficia generi humano collata stellis ac viris claris deitatis nomen indiderunt. Tu ipsam in infinitos deos dissipasti. Infinitas enim energias Deo iure at(t)ribuere potes; a quarum qualibet cum aliquod genus perfectionis accipiat quo ex se caret, quid aliud deest, nisi ut ipsum Deum trinum et unum sua deitate spolies et nil esse dicas?

[20r] Preterea, cum patres tui te Ephesiis in presulem preficere vellent, non prius pontificii dignitate ornaverunt quam iureiurando pollicitus fueris ut que Gregorius Palama in sua edicione – quam 'tomon' nominavit – edocet, indubitata fide susciperes ac defensares.³⁸ Ille autem, inter ceteras blasphemias differentias quas essentie divine et suis energiis fabricavit, has etiam addidit: ut divina essentia creature minime appropinquet; quod energia facit. Nam si divina magestas – ut ait – creature iungeretur, ipsam omnino absumeret. Energia vero proxime facta quoddam temperamentum facit, propterea et ipsam inhabitat, illuminat, docet, sanctificat atque deificat, que a divina essentia, ut ipse fingit, proficisci minime possunt. Item, energiam dicit extremum hominis finem, hereditatem sanctorum summamque felicitatem. Hec a divina essentia prorsus adimit. Solum deitatis nomen dicit ipsis esse commune. Si igitur illa summa deitas ex se inter non-entia numeratur, si omnem entitatem

37 Gregorius Nazianzenus, *In theophania* (orat. 38) 7, PG 36 col. 317, 26–27: οἷόν τι πέλαγος οὐσίας ἀπειρον καὶ ἀόριστον.

38 Cf. Gregorius Palamas, *Tomus hagioreiticus* (ed. Panagiotis Christou, Georgios Mantzaridis, Nikos Matsoukas, Vassilios Pseutogkas, *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμά Συγγράμματα. Τόμος Β', Πραγματεῖαι καὶ ἐπιστολαὶ γραφεῖσαι κατὰ τὰ ἔτη 1340–1346* [Thessaloniki: Kyromanos, 1994], 567).

et excellentiam ab aliis accipit, si creature inaccessibilis, si propinquare nobis sine nostro interitu nequeat, si non docet nec illuminat aut sanctificat, si finis non est quem omnibus hominibus natura indixit, vana sunt igitur sacrificia que illi offerimus, | nil prosunt preces, nil lacrimae, nulle religiose observantie [20v] Christianis populis proficere possunt. Unde et aliam fidem querere oportebit et novam religionem cudere. Que omnia etiam ipsos demones terrent, cum ipsi illum Deum unum et solum credant et contremiscant.

Ceterum, cum pro salute humani generis Verbum Patris e celo demissum sese nature mortalium iunxit, affuitne illic et divina essentia?

EPHESINUS: Affuit.

COLOSSENSIS: Oportet igitur ut e duobus alterum hodie ab ore tuo audiamus. Si appropinquavit nature hominis et ipsam absumpsit atque delevit, sicut Palama blasphematur, mox nobis duo heresiarchae ab inferis emergerunt: Palama ipse, scilicet preceptor tuus, velut ille Dioscorus, et tu, Euthiches archimandrita, qui indocte fugientes Nescorii heresim in corruptiorem delapsi sunt.³⁹ Si vero divina entitas in illa ineffabili unione naturam mortalium integram involatamque servavit, sicut religio Catholica predicat, profecto fides quam in tuo pontificio professus es te in extremum interitum ducit. [21r]

EPHESINUS: Hec cum nostro proposito aliena sint, ociosum est ipsa in hac disputatione discutere. Tantum sententiis patrum respondeas.

COLOSSENSIS: Non sunt aliena, imo ad confutandam illam tuam inanem ostentationem haud modicum proxima. Sed ut pollicitationi tue satisfaciam, venio ad sanctorum patrum sententias. Pro quo illud in primis aio⁴⁰ repetendum: quod cum supremum agens sua potentia extremum passum attigerit, omnia interposita ea concordia collocavit ut alia aliis preessent atque subessent. Quod et Pithagoras M(n)isarchides Samius intellexit, cum unitatem attingentem in definitam dualitatem omnia intermedia in quadam armonia constituisse affirmet.⁴¹ Presidentia vero atque subiectio in tanta rerum varietate non solum in dignitate nature spectanda est, sed in perfectionis collatione, in qua unum perficiens alterum perfectum nominatur. Et conferens quidem participatum aut participabile, cui vero perfectio collata est, 'participans' appellatur. Et quia in illo ordine rerum in infinitum eundem non est, ideo quod recipit minus perfectionis non per se aut ex se, sed participatione alterius tale nominatur; quod autem tribuit, iam non aliunde, sed per se rem habet [21v]

39 Dioscorus of Alexandria and the Archimandrite Eutyches were condemned in the mid-fifth century.

40 aio] animo MS

41 Pythagoras of Samos was known to the Byzantines as the son of Mnesarchos, cf. e.g. Suda s.v. (ed. Ada Adler, *Suidae Lexicon*, 5 vol. [Leipzig: Teubner, 1928–1938] IV, 262, 15).

et nomen. Homo enim ab humanitate homo est et nominatur. Humanitas vero non aliunde, sed ex se talis est. Album ab albedine rem et nomen accepit. Albedo vero iam non per aliud, sed per se albet. Bonumque bonitate boni nomen accepit. Ipsa vero sine alieno presidio bona est. Propterea et Moysi, sciscitanti Deum quod sibi nomen esset, respondit:⁴² ‘Qui est,’ velut is qui omnibus esse confert. Ipse autem a nullo prorsus, sed a se illud sibi eterna dignitate vendicavit.

[22r] Dyonisii ergo comparatio non inter divinam substantiam et suas energias intelligenda est, sed fertur ad particulares creaturas, que per se suarum perfectionum entitatem et appellationem habent et aliis tribuunt. Has, si cum summa illa ac | simplicissima natura conferre volueris, non amplius ‘perfectio-
[22r] nes’ nominabis, sed ‘defectiones’. Distant enim ab illa excellentissima entitate illis differentiis quas in medium attulisti.

Utque sentias hanc esse intelligentiam Dyonisii, audi ipsum in alio loco eiusdem editionis ita philosophantem:⁴³

Καθόσον γάρ⁴⁴ ὑπερέχουσι τῶν οὐκ ὄντων τὰ ὄντα, ἅγια καὶ βασιλικά καὶ κύρια καὶ θεῖα⁴⁵ καὶ αὖ τῶν⁴⁶ μετεχόντων αἱ μετοχαί⁴⁷, κατὰ τοσοῦτον ὑπερίδρυνται πάντων τῶν ὄντων ὁ ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ ὄντα καὶ πάντων τῶν μετεχόντων καὶ μετοχῶν ὁ ἀμέθεκτος αἴτιος.

Quantum prestant, inquit, entia non-entibus entia sancta atque regalia et dominantia atque divina, similiter et participabilia participantibus, tantum presidet omnibus entibus qui est super omnia et omnibus participantibus et participiis imparticipabilis causa.

[22v] Hee collationes, ut tu etiam vides, non ad divinam substantiam et suas dignitates, sed ad res creatas | earumque perfectiones attinent. Quod negare non potes, nisi Dyonisio contradicas.

42 Ex 3.14.

43 Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, *De divinis nominibus* XII, c. 4, ed. Suchla, 225, 17–20, but Andreas’ Greek is closer to the Latin than to the edited Greek text.

44 γάρ] *om.* Suchla

45 ἅγια καὶ βασιλικά καὶ κύρια καὶ θεῖα] ἅγια ἢ θεῖα ἢ κύρια ἢ βασιλικά Suchla

46 αὖ τῶν] the normal text in Suchla has αὐτῶν, but αὖ τῶν is noted as a variant in the apparatus (attested in Cod. Vat. gr. 370).

47 μετοχαί] αὐτομετοχαί Suchla

Utque recte intelligamus quid Damascenus⁴⁸ et beatus Gregorius in illis differentiis senserint, paulo altius incipere oportet. Illud itaque ignorari non habet, ut quanto scilicet virtus agentis superior est, tanto paucioribus adiumentis efficit quod inferiores potentie pluribus suffragiis facere gestiunt. Nam sol sua claritate aut altera occultiore natura siccum humidum album et nigrum efficit, ad que conficienda vix singule inferiores qualitates efficere possunt. Et fantasia una et sola existens ad gustabilia gustus, ad olphabilia olphatus, ad visibilia visus optinet locum. At intellectus superveniens omnium sensuum atque fantasie obiecta percipit additque aliud longe prestantius. Cognoscit enim preteritum atque futurum et ipsum universale absque materialium dispositionum aspectu. Non mirum igitur si divinum ens propter eius immensam simplicitatem atque perfectionem ad Filium et Spiritum quidem velut | natura, ad creaturas vero voluntatis vim et officium habeat. Et hoc pro Damasceni sententia Gregorii quoque differentia quo pacto intelligi habeat Catholica veritas docet. Cum enim nulla in entibus adeo excellens perfectio inveniat quae ab omni defectione immunis sit, oportet eam cum ea conditione a ratione humana intelligi. Nam et voluntas id perfectionis habet ut volentem faciat, sed deest cum per se constare non possit. Volens vero, cum per se constet quod quedam dignitas est, deficit cum velle ab alio mutuatur. Vis generandi prestat ei quod generat, sed deficit quia substat non potest quod generans ex se habet. Ita omnibus rebus ille Sapientissimus Artifex talem conditionem indixit ut mutuis officiis sibi ipsis subveniant. Sed cum ad perfectissimi simplicissimique entis cognitionem humana ratio pervenire non possit, nisi ex iis quae a rebus inferioribus colligit, cogitur illic etiam aliquod genus differentie ponere. Cumque sciat nullam esse divine essentiae discretionem realem cum aliquo quod in ea existat, quippe cum omnis | compositio ab ea prorsus relegata sit, tale iudicium de iis omnibus facit, ut in creatis entibus rei et rationis, in divina vero natura cum iis quae sibi attributa sunt solam discretionem rationis in esse dicit. Hec sanctissimi patres, quos tu testes protulisti, intelligentes illas differentias prosuerunt. Sed et ex iis quae respersimus⁴⁹ illud sequi necesse est, ut nullus Catholice veritatis preceptor inveniri possit cuius magisterio te committere audeas, nisi forte Arrio, Macedonio, Nestorio, Dioscoro, quos tanquam edacissimum ignem Orientalis Ecclesia protulit. Ad quem extinguendum occurrerunt Romani pontifices Silvester, Damassus, Celestinus, Leo, et ceteri presules sedis illius. Pudet certe meminisse eorum quos tu sequi gloriaris.

48 Damascenus] Damasenus *a.c. s.l.* MS

49 respersimus] *pro* repperimus? respeximus?

Vides quantum ille tuus pestilens error et inflata iactantia evagari nos fecerit? Recede igitur a tam prava sententia et te ad saniores doctrinam adige. [24r] Secus ille piissimus Deus, quem tu scelestissimo ore omnibus suis | dignitatibus spoliasti et ad nihilum deduxisse visus es, eternis suppliciis has iniurias ulciscetur.

Sed redeo ab alias tuas iniurias in genus Latinum et Romanam Ecclesiam:⁵⁰

Λέγει γάρ ὁ θεοφόρος καὶ ὁμολογητὴς Μάξιμος⁵¹ ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας, ἥς ἡ ἐπιγραφή· « περὶ τοῦ τίνων σύμβολα τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπὶ τῆς θείας συνάξεως τελούμενα » καθέστηκεν, ἐν κεφαλαίῳ, οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφή· « τίνων⁵² εἰς σύμβολα ἢ τε πρώτη τῆς ἁγίας συνάξεως εἴσοδος καὶ τὰ μετ' αὐτὴν τελούμενα », τοιαῦτα ῥητῶς· « τὴν μὲν⁵³ πρώτην εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως κατὰ τὴν ἱεράν σύναξιν εἴσοδον τῆς πρώτης τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ⁵⁴ Χριστοῦ διὰ σαρκὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον παρουσίας τύπον καὶ εἰκόνα φέρειν ὁ λόγος διδάσκει⁵⁵, δι' ἧς τὴν δουλωθεῖσαν τῇ φθορᾷ καὶ παραθεῖσαν ὑφ' ἑαυτῆς τῷ θανάτῳ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ βασιλευομένην τυραννικῶς ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου τῶν ἀνθρώπων | φύσιν ἐλευθερώσας τὴν καὶ λυτρωσάμενος πᾶσαν⁵⁶ τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν⁵⁷ ὀφειλήν, ὡς ὑπεύθυνος δοῦς⁵⁸ ὁ ἀνεύθυνος καὶ ἀναμάρτητος, πάλιν πρὸς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐπανάγαγε τῆς βασιλείας χάριν, ἑαυτὸν λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν δοῦς⁵⁹ καὶ ἀντάλλαγμα καὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων φθοροποιῶν παθημάτων τὸ ζωοποιὸν αὐτοῦ πάθος ἀντιδοῦς παιώνιον ἄκος καὶ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου σωτήριον. μεθ' ἣν παρουσίαν ἡ εἰς οὐρανούς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν ὑπερουράνιον θρόνον ἀνάβασίς τε καὶ ἀποκατάστασις συμβολικῶς τυποῦται διὰ τῆς ἐν τῷ ἱερατεῖ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως εἰσόδου καὶ τῆς εἰς τὸν θρόνον τὸν ἀρχιερατικὸν⁶⁰ ἀναβάσεως. »

50 Marcus Eugenius, *Epistola ad Georgium presbyterum* 1 (ed. Petit, 471, 11–473, 2).

51 Maximus Confessor, *Mystagogia* 8 (604–619, ed. Christian Boudignon, *Maximi Confessoris Mystagogia una cum latina interpretatione Anastasii bibliothecarii* [Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 69] [Turnhout: Brepols, 2011]).

52 τίνων] περὶ τοῦ τίνων σύμβολα καὶ τίνων MS (pauperam repetens initium tituli prioris)

53 μὲν] μὲν οὖν Boudignon 604

54 Ἰησοῦ] om. Boudignon 606

55 φέρειν ὁ λόγος διδάσκει] φέρειν ἐδίδασκεν Boudignon 607

56 πᾶσαν] πᾶσαν v, καὶ πᾶσαν Boudignon 611

57 ἡμῶν] αὐτῆς Petit 471, 29 et Boudignon 611

58 δοῦς] ἀποδοῦς Petit 471, 29 et Boudignon 611

59 ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν δοῦς] δοῦς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Boudignon 613

60 ἀρχιερατικὸν] ἱερατικὸν Petit 472, 3 et Boudignon 619

Ταῦτα μὲν ὁ ἅγιος περὶ τῆς πρώτης εἰσόδου φησί. περὶ⁶¹ τῆς δευτέρας αὐθις τῆς καὶ μεγάλης λεγομένης ἐν κεφαλαίῳ, οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφή· « τί σημαίνει ἡ τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων εἴσοδος », τοιαῦτα φησί.⁶² « ἡ⁶³ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ σεπτῶν μυστηρίων εἴσοδος ἀρχὴ καὶ προοίμιόν ἐστι⁶⁴ τῆς γενησομένης ἐν οὐρανοῖς καινῆς διδασκαλίας περὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ ἐν ἀδύτοις κρυφιώτητος, τῆς θείας φημί,⁶⁵ ὄντος | μυστηρίου τῆς ἡμῶν [25r] σωτηρίας· « οὐ γὰρ μὴ πίομαί⁶⁶ » φησι πρὸς τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητάς ὁ θεὸς καὶ λόγος, « ἀπάρτι ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος⁶⁷ τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν⁶⁸ καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν⁶⁹ ». ⁷⁰ ἀκούεις, ὅπως ἅγια καὶ σεπτὰ μυστήρια καὶ πρὸ τοῦ τελειωθῆναι τὰ θεῖα δῶρα καλεῖ ὁ διδάσκαλος; καὶ εἰκότως· βασιλεὺς γὰρ λέγεται καὶ πρὸ τοῦ στεφθῆναι ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ μάλιστα ὅτε πρὸς τὸ στεφθῆναι ἀπέρχεται, δωρυφορούμενος καὶ τιμώμενος. βασιλεὺς λέγεται καὶ ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰκὼν καὶ τιμᾶται καὶ προσκυνεῖται. τύπον δὲ καὶ εἰκόνα λέγομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀποσφύζειν τὰ θεῖα δῶρα πρὸ τοῦ τελειωθῆναι τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος. ὅθεν καὶ ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ λειτουργίᾳ, ἀντίτυπα ταῦτα καλεῖ·⁷¹ « προθέντες » γὰρ φησι « τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ τιμίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. » τί οὖν ποιοῦμεν ἄτοπον, εἰ μετὰ τιμῆς προπέμπομεν καὶ ὑποδεχόμεθα ταῦτα τὰ ἤδη τῷ θεῷ ἀνατεθέντα καὶ ἀφιερωθέντα καὶ θυσία καὶ δῶρα γιγνόμενα⁷² καὶ πρὸς τὸ τελειωθῆναι διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσεως προσφερόμενα; | ἀλλ' οἱ διυλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα, τὴν δὲ κάμηλον καταπίνοντες⁷³ τάχα καὶ τῆς [25v] τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων ἡμῖν τιμῆς ἐγκαλέσουσιν⁷⁴, ὅτι προσκυνούμεν αὐτάς, ἐπεὶ μὴ εἰσὶν αὐτὰ τὰ πρωτότυπα, ἀλλ' εἰκόνες ἐκείνων· εἴη γὰρ ἂν καὶ τοῦτο τῆς αὐτῶν ἀπονοίας ἄξιον.

61 περὶ] περὶ δὲ Petit 472, 5

62 Maximus Confessor, *Mystagogia* 16 (721–728, ed. Boudignon.)

63 ἡ] ἡ δὲ Boudignon 721

64 ἐστι] ἐστίν, ὡς ὁ μέγας ἐκείνος ἔφασκε γέρων Boudignon 722

65 κρυφιώτητος, τῆς θείας φημί] τῆς θείας κρυφιώτητος Petit 472, 12 et Boudignon 724–725

66 πίομαί] πίνω Boudignon 726

67 γεννήματος] γενήματος Boudignon 727

68 ὑμῶν] ἡμῶν MS

69 τῶν οὐρανῶν] τοῦ πατρὸς μου Boudignon 728

70 Mt 26, 29.

71 *Liturgia Basilii* 329, 24, ed. Frank Edward Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896).

72 γιγνόμενα] γενόμενα Petit 472, 34

73 Mt. 23.24.

74 τῆς τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων ἡμῖν τιμῆς ἐγκαλέσουσιν] περὶ ἁγίων εἰκόνων ἡμῖν ἐγκαλ. Petit 472, 38

Ait enim theophorus et confessor Maximus in editione qua pro sacra missa habuerat cuius titulus de eo, ut quorum scilicet similitudines sunt hec que secundum sanctam ecclesiam in sacra congregatione celebrantur, in capitulo cuius superscriptio *Quorum sunt simbola*, primus videlicet sacre congregationis introitus, et ille qui post ipsum celebratur, his⁷⁵ verbis: "Primum quidem introitum pontificis ad sanctam ecclesiam secundum sacram congregationem primum aditum Filii Dei et Salvatoris nostri Ihesu Christi per carnem designare⁷⁶ typumque esse atque ymaginem, ipsa ratio docet. Propter quod naturam hominum que corruptioni serviebat, a se venditam morti propter peccatum et Dyaboli tyrannico⁷⁷ imperio subactam, idem Salvator liberans atque eripiens omne illius debitum velut reus qui sine peccato et reatu existit, persolvit et ad pristinam regni gratiam reduxit, dans se ipsum pro nobis precium et commutationem, atque pro nostris corruptivis passio[n]ibus per suam vivificam passionem se ipsum tradidit medicinalem curam et mundi totius salvationem. Ascensus autem in celos sedemque supernam post adventum in carnem symbolice figuratur per introitum pontificis in altare et ascensum in sedem sacerdotalem." Et hec sanctus ille de primo introitu dixit. De secundo autem, qui et 'magnus' nominatus est, in capitulo cuius superscriptio *Quid significat sanctorum misteriorum introitus*, talia dicit: "Sanctorum ac venerandorum misteriorum introitus principium ac prohemium est nove doctrine que de dispensatione Dei ad nos in celis futura est; revelatio misterii insuper circa abdita divine occultationis pro nostra salute institute. Ait enim ad suos discipulos:⁷⁸ 'Non bibam amodo de genimine vinee usque in diem illum quando illud bibam vobiscum novum in regno celorum.'" Audis quo pacto antequam compleantur, hec misteria 'sancta et veneranda' vocat magister, et apte. 'Rex' enim dicitur quis et | antequam in regem coronetur, et maxime cum ad coronam suscipiendam accedit preventus honoribus atque muneribus 'rex' dicitur, et regis ymago honorata et adorata. Unde et nos figuram et typum dicimus preferre divina munera antequam in corpus et dominicum sanguinem compleantur. Unde et magnus Basilius in sacra missa 'antypa' ipsa appellat: "Proponentes," inquit, "antypa pretiosi corporis et sanguinis Christi tui." Quid igitur inconvenientis facimus si cum honore premittimus ac suscipimus hec que iam Deo proposita et consecrata sacrificia et

75 his] loquitur *add.* MS

76 designare] designat MS

77 tyrannico] tyrannico MS

78 Mt 26.29.

munera facta sunt et ab ipso perficienda per adventum Spiritus Sancti offeruntur? Sed ii qui culicem nauseant, camelum vero inglutunt, forte nos accusabunt de imaginibus, quoniam ipsas adoramus, cum non sint ipsa prototypa sed eorum ymagines. Sed et hoc sit eorum insipientie dignum.

COLOSSENSIS: Nemo Latinorum recte sentiens alienum a sana eruditione dicet quod prima | illa tua isodus sive introitus presentiam Salvatoris in carnem, redemptionem quoque hominis per passionem eius, et tandem reditum in celestem sedem significet, quodque secunda principium ac prohemium sit nove doctrine que beatis in superna patria revelanda est, cum in eterno convivio sederint. Latini igitur non ista accusant. Sed quedam in his ceremoniis a tuis celebrantur omni reprehensione dignissima. [27v]

EPHESINUS: Que sunt illa nostra a Latinis reprehendenda?

COLOSSENSIS: Certe plurima. Sed id presertim quo in missalibus observantiis summe adoras, quod adorandum non est, cumque tempus adorationis advenerit, nullam aut pertenuem venerationem ostendis, fisque ydololatrie persimilis.

EPHESINUS: Absit a nobis tanta infidelitatis cecitas. Doce itaque quid te in hanc nostram calumniam inducit. Secus agam iniuriarum.

COLOSSENSIS: Cum in illa prima sacerdotis isodo tu et ceteri tuorum proni adora|tis, fletis, gemitis, pectus tunditis supplicantes, cui hoc genus latrie ascribitis? [28r]

EPHESINUS: Illis que beatus Maximus 'misteria divina et veneranda munera' vocat.

COLOSSENSIS: Maximi atque Basilii de misterio corporis et sanguinis sententie vere sunt, si quis eis propriam intelligentiam dederit. Sed prius tuum audiamus iudicium et de iis postea. Cum panis et vinum circumferuntur, quid divinitatis habent ut tanta veneratione ipsa digna existimes? Nam non puto te in eam ignaviam incidisse ut credas successu temporis illud misterium fieri, cum inter divinam naturalemque actionem hoc intersit ut illa sua immensa potentia totum passum contingens extimplo faciat quod faciendum prius statuerat; natura vero, cum id facere nequeat, partem ante partem passi sibi assimilat. Preterea, si illa admirabilis transubstanciatio successionem temporis expetit, querere oportebit que pars panis quam portionem | Dominici corporis vendicet, si caput, si manus, si membrorum aliorum quodlibet. Et sic pro eo tempore semi-christum et semi-deum haberemus, que auditu horrentia sunt. [28v]

EPHESINUS: Quid discutere expedit quod omnibus sapientibus liquet? Misterium enim Dominici corporis ad sui efficientiam nullo fluxu temporis eget. Divinum itaque ac venerandum a sanctis patribus non ideo sacramento

illi tribuitur ut factum sit aut fluxu temporis egeat, sed quia portio panis iam sanctissimo corpori dedicata⁷⁹ adoratione et veneratione digna putatur.

COLOSSENSIS: Hec tua responsio illo te ducit ubi te audire cupio. Si quidem panis ac vinum dum deferuntur nil aliud divinitatis habent nisi quod sacratissimo corpori dedicata sint, manent ergo in sua natura preter hanc devocionem ultra ceteras creaturas habentia nihil. Respectus autem ille quedam relatio est, quam adorare non convenit. Essent enim pene infinita adoratione digna cum
[29r] innumerabiles sint | respectus creaturarum in Deum. Tua igitur adoratio pani ascribitur, quam ydololatriam vocari convenit.

EPHESINUS: Nunquam adeo te tantum nescium esse credidissem ut hoc non intelligeres. Quamquam relationi illi adoratio non conveniat, adiecta nihilominus substantie panis facit utrumque adorandum.

COLOSSENSIS: Ignarus omnino esset qui hac tua responsione non videret in quod genus superstitionis dilaberis. Si relatio ad sacramentum altaris panem adorandum efficit, non video cur ceterarum creaturarum aspectus in Deum nobis venerandas non faciat.

EPHESINUS: Hanc tuam dubietatem iam solvimus cum de rege ac eius ymagine vulgatum exemplum dedissemus. Ipse enim adoratur cum ad coronationem accedit. Imago etiam eius magna veneratione habita est, cum tamen natura longissime distet. Hac itaque ratione et hic panis venerandus dicitur,
[29v] quia fertur ad illam ineffabilem permutationem similisque extat ei | qui postea in altari adventu⁸⁰ Spiritus Sancti per omnia sacer efficitur.

COLOSSENSIS: Nec tuum exemplum nec alia quevis ratio te a tanta superstitione salvum facere potest, quo fateri non habeas ceteras quoque creaturas adorandas esse veneratione divina.

EPHESINUS: Quo pacto?

COLOSSENSIS: Quia nulla rerum entitas est cui Deus in producendo ymaginem aut suum vestigium non reliquerit, imaginem quidem iis qui rationis participes sunt, vestigium vero que illa excellentia carent. Eoque amplius ille venerabiliores fore videntur quo genus illud similitudinum cetera entia ab ipsa sua institutione innatum atque coevum sibi habuerint, typus autem panis ex tempore et sacrificantis decreto inductus est. Similitudo autem de rege ac ipsius ymagine non recte accedit. Rex enim idem est iens et qui coronatur. Quippe cum eius substantia in nullo varietatem acceperit, purpura et honor coronationem non iniuria prevenit, quod in panis natura dicere minime habes.
[30r] Ceterum, | si ille successu sanguinis aut delectu populi sive senatus regis appellationem accepit, iam rex est et ante corone susceptionem. Cum igitur regiam

79 dedicata] est *add.* MS

80 adventu] adventum MS

magestatem decor ille sequatur, mirari non habes ut munera et honores coronam preveniant. Imago autem et si natura longissime distet, accidentium tamen aptissima compositio ad regium typum ipsam adorandam efficit, que in panis ac vini ambitu inveniri non potest. Nihil itaque habes in illa circuitione similitudinis ad corpus Dominicum quod adorari digne arbitreris.

EPHESINUS: Cum hec tua argumentatio ad longissimam digressionem nos inducat, illi respondere non statuo. Solum hoc facito ut ille sanctissimorum patrum sententie quas in medium protuli illese persistant.

COLOSSENSIS: Vellem tantum fidei te daturum iis que dicam quantum sanum intellectum Christo donante illis sententiis tribuam. Illud tamen in primis sciri convenit ut sanctum, sacrum, venerandum, et huiusce ordinis | nomina multiplicem significationem contineant sintque omonima et, ut [30v] Latinis placet, equivoca. Est enim sanctum quod non solum per se sanctum sed et totius sanctitatis fons et origo est. Sancti et ii qui excellentissimo dono divine maiestatis prius sancti quam nati extiterunt. Sanctum et omne masculinum matricem aperiens secundum Musaice legis institutionem. Sanctus et qui divino obsequio adscitus est. Propterea et tu in principio huius tue epistole sacerdotem Georgium 'sanctum' nominas: « Sit, » inquis, « sospes sanctitas tua. » Sanctum vel sacrum quod, et si sanctitatem in se habere non possit propter nature ineptitudinem, quia tamen usui divinorum misteriorum adiecta sunt, 'sacra' nominantur, sicut in libro Leviticorum vasa et indumenta in templo ministrantium dici solebant.⁸¹ Panis igitur, quem tu tanta veneratione circumfers, ministerio divino ascriptus est, nihil plus pro eo tempore circuitionis sanctitatis habens quam sacerdos qui defert, quamquam non longe post, servato ritu vere religionis, substantia eius in dignissimam | naturam transitura [31r] sit. Hoc autem cum futurum extet, vehementissime erras cum tuis qui tempus vere adorationis insipienter prevenis. Antytipum etiam eandem varietatem significationis videtur habere. Nam cum prototypum atque antitypum mutua quadam respectione conveniant, sitque primum idea aut exemplar, alterum vero ymago illius vel operis imitatio, sicut sapientissimis visum est, in pane qui ad sacrificandum defertur sanctum, venerandum, atque antytipum aptissime reperitur. Substantia enim panis 'sanctum' et 'venerandum' nominatur, quia iam Deo ascripta est. Speties vero sacramentales que in accidentibus panis constant antitypa sunt eorum que non longe postea in sacramento apparent.

EPHESINUS: Ego multiplex illud sanctitatis genus a te designatum non moleste audio. Quod vero de spetiebus et accidentibus memorasti ferre non possum.

COLOSSENSIS: Cui hoc?

81 Lv 8.6–11.

[31v] EPHESINUS: Quia cum dicis accidentia panis que deferuntur antitypa esse | earum spetierum que postea in sacramento apparebunt, affers nobis novum inauditumque philosophandi genus. Quorum enim accidentia que in pane ac vino conspicimus antitypa sunt, suine aut aliorum? Sui esse non possunt. Nam omnibus entibus a natura simul negatum est, ut quicquam ymago sui aut similitudo dici possit, cum prototyporum presentia antityporum aspectum non patiat. Si vero dicis accidentia illa typos esse aliorum, docere te convenit quomodo que inerant corrumpantur, quomodo alia ex ipsis generentur, que necessitas ad hoc naturam impellit, cum non plus illa officii factura sint quam ea que preexistunt. Audiamus igitur novum filosofum.

[32r] COLOSSENSIS: Si Salvator in hoc misterio sui corporis naturam ministram advocaret, nullo iure novum philosophum querereres. Nunc autem, cum in hoc admirabili opere natura substans admiretur et stupeat potentiam creatoris, mirandum non est si pro rerum varietate novum etiam philosophie genus adveni|at. Dico igitur: accidentia que pridem pani inerant antitypa sunt, non eorum que postea generari habent, sed sui, alia tamen conditione adiecta.

EPHESINUS: Cum aliquid typum dixeris, mox illud aliud ab eo cuius typus est significabis. Quomodo igitur potentissimus atque equissimus Deus in hoc suo religiosissimo opere contradictionem includi patietur, ut species ille sacramentales maneant, et tamen alie esse intelligantur?

COLOSSENSIS: Ideo immense potentie atque sapientie Deus creditur esse, ut aliquid faciat ad cuius integram perceptionem humana ratio relicta sue nature pervenire non possit.

EPHESINUS: Recte loquutus es. Sed tandem ostende qua ratione accidentia illa suimet antitypa sint.

[32v] COLOSSENSIS: Nosti, ut opinor, naturam nulla sua potentia facere posse ut per se accidentia substant, quod nutrant, quod ex eis aliquid generetur. Sunt enim hec omnia substantie propria. Deus autem, cuius virtus aliquo fine artari non potest, pro maiestate sui sanctissimi corporis illa quae iam enu|meravi-
mus singularissimo munere accidentibus donat ornatque illa quadam mirifica excellentia, ut intelligere nequeas post consecrationem misterii accidentia ne vel substantie dici debeant.

EPHESINUS: Quia humane perceptioni abdita sunt, ideo indiscussa fide hec suscipi convenit. Pretereamus igitur illa scilento et ad typum eorum redeamus.

COLOSSENSIS: Si superiora a te fide suscepta sunt, facile et typum eorum intelliges. Si panem et vinum ante consecratum corpus inspexeris, eadem accidentia invenies que post in sacramento apparent, illa conditione adiecta: ut species ille priores substantie dignitatem non habeant nec corpus Dominicum celent, que mox divina maiestas eisdem mirifice confert. Sunt igitur ille priores posteriorum typi atque ymagine, que ut nosti ante consecrationem nil habent

divinitatis. Sed quia video te ad huius rationis perceptionem non facile accedere, addo et aliam que cognita tibi facilior erit. Tene igitur panem quem | in altare defers antitypum esse Domini corporis. Quod enim hic sensibili efficientia continet, ille spiritali quadam operatione in suis fidelibus egit. Ille flagrantissimo karitatis ardore in ligno crucis extorruit. Et hic in clibano clausus esui hominum aptissimus extat. Ille se digne sumentibus gratiam confert preservatque eos a futuro peccatorum interitu. Quod hic materiali usu efficere solet. Etiam ex racemis in torculari compressis vinum confluit. Et Salvator sciscitanti Ysaie cur vestimentum suum detinctum foret respondit se solum torcular calcasse.⁸² Vinum hoc iocundum hominem facit, sanguis ille religiose sumptus spiritali oblectatione mentem letificat. Sunt igitur hec tua corporalia munera hac⁸³ conditione illorum spiritualium donorum antitypa. Que tamen ante sanctificationis momentum illo modo a te coli non debent. Non igitur sapientissimus preceptor re et nomine Maximus nec magnus Basilus illud superstitionis genus te docuerunt, ut pani ac vino cultum divinum afferas. Illud etiam | non minori reprehensione dignum existima. Nam si panem pro eo quod ad consecrationem defertur tanta veneratione prevenis, quanto maiore observatione a te habendus est cum in corpus Dominicum transit? Quod tamen minime servas. Unde Filius Dei iure adversum te insurgere potest ut venerationem sue divinitati ascriptam pani contuleris. [33r]

EPHESINUS: Plura sunt nostra quibus iure Salvator indignatur, sed in hoc nil sibi iniuriarum ascribet. Nam pontifex, cum preces pro se et populo devotus effudit, tunc Spiritus Sanctus illa sua presentia ineffabili sacramentum Dominicum conficit.

COLOSSENSIS: Hoc quod loqueris pium quidem est. Sed ad recte credendum plurimis indiget, sed illo precipue: nam si cultus Dominici corporis in ipso accessu Spiritus Sancti longe religiosior esse debet illo quem tu pani afferre soles, populus Christianus in illo admirabili opere ignarus ociosusque stare non debet, quod tamen tu non servas nec servandum arbitraris. Deinde ignorare non habes quibus verbis usus Spiritus Sancti adventum merueris, tuisne aut ali|cuius prestantioris potentie, quod in hac dignissima re te scire oportet, si tandem tibi cura est ydololatriam evadere. [34r]

EPHESINUS: In sacris misteriis plurima latent ad quorum cognitionem vix etiam doctissimi viri attingere possunt, de quorum numero est etiam illud momentum temporis quo Spiritus Sanctus adveniens illud opus mirificum efficit.

82 Is 63.2–3.

83 hac] *mg.* MS

COLOSSENSIS: Quod plurima in hoc sacramento existant viris etiam eruditius abdita fateri oportet, si quidem et illud nomen ‘misterii’ maxime docet. Sed Spiritus Sancti adventus corporisque sacri presentia populo expectanti et religiose intento ignota esse non debent. Secus enim in alterum errorum Ecclesiam Dei frequentissime incidere necesse est, ut scilicet adoret quod adoratione dignum non est, et ecce iam tua ydololatria, aut putet nondum Spiritum adventasse celebrasseque misterium qui, consummato officio, sacramentum nobis reliquit, quod umbre legali simillimum est.

[34v] EPHESINUS: Omni ratione credendum fore existimo inter celebrandum aliqua | esse dicta gestaque, quibus sacramentum illud conficit.

COLOSSENSIS: Recte existimas. Sed indica, obsecro, que verba sunt quorum usus tantum sacramentum perficere possit.

EPHESINUS: Plurima certe, preces, supplicationes, obsecrationes, sed presertim illud quo sacerdos mente simul et oculis in celum erectus:⁸⁴

Καὶ⁸⁵ ποιήσον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου.

Et facito panem hunc preciosum corpus Christi tui, et hoc quod in calice est preciosum sanguinem Filii tui.

COLOSSENSIS: Quis est ille qui hunc verborum ordinem edidit?

EPHESINUS: Huius formule quidam Basilium, alii Iohannem Chrisostomum autorem dicunt.

COLOSSENSIS: Nec Basilius neque Iohannes Ore Aureus, sed neque quispiam Catholice veritatis doctor suis verbis efficere potest tam inauditum miraculum.

[35r] EPHESINUS: Quem putas Deo magis dignum existere, magnum Basilium vel unum quempiam sacerdotum qui quottidianis sacris inserviunt? |

COLOSSENSIS: Nulla merita talium sacerdotum religioni et sapientie Basilii magni equiparanda sunt.

EPHESINUS: Ita optabam te responsurum: si igitur unus de iis quos diximus sacerdotibus narrando et sepe imperando baptizat, cur in hoc sacramento illa sua auctoritate functus hanc rem divinam non efficit?

COLOSSENSIS: Longe inter se distant cetera sacramenta et hoc admirandum misterium. Nam illa, cum materiam sacratam aliunde expetant,⁸⁶ in usu

84 Ioannes Chrysostomus, *Ordo divini sacrificii*, PG 63, 916, 48–49 et 52–53.

85 καὶ] καὶ MS, om. PG

86 expetant] expectant MS

huiusce materie perfectionem accipiunt. Hoc autem sacrum misterium in consecratione subiecte materie perfici creditur. Differt autem quam plurimum ut minister materiam sacram accipiat ipsamque pro suo usu perficere velit, et aliam perficiendo sacram efficiat. Primum officium verba iubentis, deprecantis, aut enarrantis patitur, alterum, quia altioris et dignioris virtutis est, ad sanctificationem subiecte materie nulli humani sermones suppetunt, nulla merita prosunt.

EPHESINUS: Cum paucissimis verbis plurima discussione digna | involveris, [35v] nisi patentissimum exemplum audiam, iam fateor me in nullo te intelligere.

COLOSSENSIS: Geram tibi morem ut familiari signo rem, ut ais, tibi perdifficilem sine dubietate intelligas.

EPHESINUS: Facias, obsecro.

COLOSSENSIS: Cum sacerdos sacro lavacro baptizandum immergit, uti turne aqua aliquo sanctificationis genere dedicata?

EPHESINUS: Nisi necessitas urgeat, benedicta et consecrata esse debet.

COLOSSENSIS: Catholice loqueris. Sed ultro mihi respondeas: cum minister Dominici corporis ad conficiendum accedit, panis quem sibi proponit estne ante illam misterii confectionem sacratus?

EPHESINUS: Minime.

COLOSSENSIS: Quando illam consecrationem accepturus est?

EPHESINUS: Cum verba quedam sacra sacerdos protulerit.

COLOSSENSIS: Usus igitur illorum verborum sine comparatione prestantior est qui materiam sue nature relictam mox sacratissimam efficit. Vides quantum consecrantis formula a ritu baptismatis distat?

EPHESINUS: Video plane et me vidisse gaudeo.

COLOSSENSIS: Ceteri itaque | religionis nostre ministri, quoniam pene in [36r] omnibus materiam sacratam inveniunt, illa enuntiando, deprecando, et sepe iubendo⁸⁷ uti possunt. In Dominici vero corporis administratione, nisi aliena verba sacerdos protulerit, efficere non potest quod ceperat.

EPHESINUS: Cum hoc luce clarius constet, repeti minime expedit. Unum est quod me vehementer sollicitat: ut sciam quis sermo ille est qui tantum efficientie habet.

COLOSSENSIS: Cogitare potes illa verba humana non esse.

EPHESINUS: Doce igitur quando et quo pacto a mente divina illa processerint.

COLOSSENSIS: Huius admirande philosophie notitiam me habere non fateor. Dicam tamen quid a patribus Dei Ecclesia tenet. Ambrosius Mediolanensium pontifex, cum de sacramentis sermonem habuisset, dixit verba quibus hoc

87 iubendo] rubendo MS

sacramentum perficitur eadem esse cum iis quibus Deus in prima rerum institutione usus est.⁸⁸

[36v] EPHESINUS: Profecto nulla verba huic mirifico operi rectius coaptari possunt | quam illa quibus tota universi structura in tantum ornatum prodiit. Probo igitur Ambrosii tui sententiam. Sed vehementer admiror cur Latini, illam institutionem relinquentes, quandam aliam formam sibi invenerint.

COLOSSENSIS: Hec forma, quam dicis Latinos invenisse, ab illo sermone non distat, sed maxime sibi conveniunt. Habet enim in hoc divino negotio uterque sermo quod faciat.

EPHESINUS: Audiamus, queso, eorum officia.

[37r] COLOSSENSIS: Ille summus sacerdos huic precipuo muneri sic annuit ut non solum effectu quo in prima rerum productione, sed et sacramenti proprietate, quam presentiam sacrificii in extremo prolationis articulo indicet, uti instituit. Et ideo adest sacerdos inferior qui verbis Dominicis usus docet inefabilem illam translationem factam corpusque Salvatoris adesse. Forma igitur verborum ab Ecclesia indicta et vim sermonis divini in traducendo et consumptionem perfectam per sacerdotis prolationem ostendit, que ambo colata | in nullo sibi adversari videntur.

EPHESINUS: Hec, et si vera esse possint, habent tamen in se plurima inquisitione digna que ad aliud tempus deferenda⁸⁹ sunt. Nunc autem, si habes aliquem alium de patribus qui de hac re apertius dicat, adducas ipsum, obsecro, ut tandem sentiam an Latini forma illa verborum inter sacrificandum recte utantur.

COLOSSENSIS: Faciam indilate eoque libentius quo tibi familiarissimum testem adducam, quem refellere non audebis. Iohannes tuus Ore et virtute Aureus, cum de cena Dominica et proditore disputaret, cuius sermonis initium est:⁹⁰

Ὅλῖγα ἀνάγκη σήμερον, πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀγάπην εἰπεῖν

Necesse est hodie apud nostram karitatem pauca dicere

his⁹¹ utitur verbis:⁹²

88 Ambrosius, *De sacramentis* IV, cc. 4–5 (PL 16, coll. 439–445; SC 25, pp. 108–114).

89 deferenda] differenda MS

90 Iohannes Chrysostomus, *De proditione Iudae* 1 (PG 49, col. 373, 1s.).

91 his] hic MS

92 Iohannes Chrysostomus, *De proditione Iudae* 6 (PG 49, col. 380, 31–46).

Πάρεστιν ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ νῦν ἐκεῖνος ὁ τὴν τράπεζαν ἐκείνην κοσμήσας⁹³, οὗτος καὶ ταύτην διακοσμεῖ νῦν· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος⁹⁴ ὁ ποιῶν τὰ προκείμενα γενέσθαι σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' ⁹⁵ ὁ σταυρωθεὶς ὑπὲρ | ἡμῶν Χριστός· [37v] σχῆμα γὰρ ἔστην πληρῶν⁹⁶ ὁ ἱερεὺς τὰ ῥήματα ἐκεῖνα φθεγγόμενος τῆς προσευχῆς⁹⁷. ἡ δὲ⁹⁸ δύναμις καὶ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν⁹⁹. « τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα »¹⁰⁰, φησί, τοῦτο τὸ ῥήμα τὰ προκείμενα μεταρρυθμίζει¹⁰¹. καὶ καθάπερ ἡ φωνή¹⁰² ἐκείνη ἡ λέγουσα « αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν »¹⁰³ ἐρρέθη μὲν ἅπαξ, διὰ παντὸς δὲ τοῦ χρόνου γίνεται τὸ ἔργον, δυναμοῦσα¹⁰⁴ τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἡμετέραν πρὸς παιδογονίαν¹⁰⁵, οὕτω καὶ αὕτη ἡ φωνή ἡ¹⁰⁶ ἅπαξ λεχθεῖσα καθ' ἐκάστην τράπεζαν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐξ ἐκείνου μέχρι σήμερον καὶ μέχρι τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας τὴν θυσίαν ἀγιάζει¹⁰⁷.

Adest, inquit, et nunc Christus qui mensam suam ornaverāt ipse et hanc nunc ornat. Non enim homo est qui proposita facit corpus et sanguinem Christi, sed ille qui pro nobis crucifixus est Christus. Nam sacerdos proferens predicationis verba figuram illius | preferat, sed potestas et gratia a [38r] Deo est:¹⁰⁸ “Hoc est,” ait, “corpus meum.” Hoc verbum proposita permutat. Et quemadmodum vox illa dicens:¹⁰⁹ “Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram,” semel quidem dicta est, semper autem fit opere confortans ipsam nostram naturam in filiorum propagationem, sic et hec semel dicta in qualibet mensa apud ecclesias ab illo usque ad hoc temporis et usque ad eius adventum sanctificat sacrificium.

93 κοσμήσας] διακοσμήσας ἐκείνην PG 49, col. 380, 32

94 οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος] οὐδὲ γάρ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν PG 49, col. 380, 33

95 ἀλλ'] ἀλλ' αὐτὸς PG 49, col. 380, 35

96 σχῆμα γὰρ ἔστην πληρῶν] σχῆμα πληρῶν ἔστηκεν PG 49, col. 380, 35–36

97 ἐκεῖνα φθεγγόμενος τῆς προσευχῆς] φθεγγόμενος ἐκεῖνα PG 49, col. 380, 36–37

98 ἡ δὲ] ἡδε MS

99 ἐστίν] ἐστι PG 49, col. 380, 37

100 Mt 26.26; Mc 14.22; Lc 22.19.

101 τὰ προκείμενα μεταρρυθμίζει] μεταριθμίζει MS, μεταρρυθμίζει τὰ προκείμενα PG 49, col. 380, 38–39

102 ἡ φωνή] *supplevimus secundum* PG 49, col. 380, 39

103 Gn 1.28.

104 δυναμοῦσα] ἔργω δυναμοῦσα PG 49, col. 380, 42

105 παιδογονίαν] παιδοποιίαν PG 49, col. 380, 43

106 αὕτη ἡ φωνή ἡ] ἡ φωνὴ αὕτη PG 49, col. 380, 43

107 ἀγιάζει] ἀπηρτισμένην ἐργάζεται PG 49, col. 380, 46–47

108 Mt 26.26; Mc 14.22; Lc 22.19.

109 Gn 1.28.

EPHESINUS: Nunquam memini me legisse hanc patris nostri sententiam. Et quia puto te vera locutum, muto omnino iudicium, illamque formulam consecrationis credo aptissime sacramento Dominico convenire.

COLOSSENSIS: Ex his manifeste videtur Latinos non nauseare culicem, camelum vero inbibere, sicut tu ipsos inique accusas, in quo calumnie genere crimen a te commissum in illos reicis. Tu enim, cum canem in ecclesia vides, clamas, vociferaris, totumque illud saccellum coinquinatum fuisse quereris.

[38v] Adorationem autem | panis, que patentissima idololatria est, velut camelum inglutis magnumque sacrificium Deo te optulisse arbitraris, cum illi parciuncule panis divinam venerationem afferre festinas. Nec quispiam Latinorum adeo nescius est, sicut tu indocte suspicaris, ut et ymago Salvatoris ab ipsis adoranda non sit, qui pani, priusquam sanctificetur, cultum Deo servatum offerre non sinunt. Nam cum ymago Christi totum corpus Dominicum ambiat adeo ut nil sibi deesse videatur nisi ut sentiat et loquatur, quod in panis figura invenire non potes, que dementia te induxit ut crederes Latinos facile ymaginum adorationem abiectum ire quia puro pani cultum divinum non afferunt? A panis igitur adoratione non solum abstineas, sed etiam alios tue damnationis conscios emenda, si vis ab eterno supplitio eripi.

Sed de hoc satis. Nunc ad aliam magnitudinem iniuriarum accedamus.

[39r] De quo an tibi respondere deberem diu | mecum cogitavi memor illius sententie:¹¹⁰ « ne respondeas stulto iuxta stultitiam suam. » Sed cum idem sapiens mox addiderit: « respondeas stulto iuxta stultitiam suam, » tuis impudicis mendatiis respondere statui. Quod faciam quam modestius potero, ne sanctimonia Romane Ecclesie tuo sordidissimo ore polluta videatur. Audiamus igitur te prius voce propria mentientem:¹¹¹

[39v] Καὶ ταῦτα τίνες; οἱ πᾶσαν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν ἀθετοῦντες οἱ ἀνὰ μέσον ἁγίου καὶ βεβήλου μὴ διαστέλλοντες· ποῦ γὰρ παρ' ἐκείνοις ἱερατεῖον τὸ¹¹² παρ' ἡμῖν λεγόμενον ἅγιον βῆμα; ποῦ παρ' ἐκείνοις ἱερατικὸς θρόνος, εἰς ὃν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀναβαίνει; ἀναγνώτωσαν τὰς τοῦ σεπτοῦ Μαξίμου φωνὰς καὶ ἐγκαλυψάσθωσαν· ιδέτωσαν, τίνες αὐτῷ μᾶλλον ἀκολουθοῦσιν καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ λόγοις, ἡμεῖς ἢ ἐκεῖνοι. καίτοι γε ὁ φωστὴρ ἐκείνος πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐπέδραμεν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀθλῶν. καὶ | τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως καὶ τὸν πλείστον χρόνον ἐν τῇ δύσει πεποίηκεν, ἐν τε τῇ Ρώμῃ καὶ τῇ Ἀφρικῇ. καὶ οὐκ ἂν ὅλως εἶπεν οὐδέν, ὃ μὴ διὰ πάσης ἐκράτει τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπάντων. ἀλλ' οἱ παραχαράκται καὶ καινοτόμοι τῆς πίστεως οὗτοι καὶ τὰ

110 Pv 26.4.

111 Marcus Eugenius, *Epistola ad Georgium presbyterum* 2 (ed. Petit, 473.2–32).

112 τὸ τὸ νῦν Petit 473, 6

ἐκκλησιαστικά ἔθῃ¹¹³ διέφθειραν καὶ ἐνήλλαξαν. καὶ θαυμαστὸν οὐδέν, ὅπου γε καὶ τὴν φύσιν αὐτὴν παρεχάραξαν, ἀντὶ ἀνδρῶν γυναικες φαινόμενοι καὶ τὸν τίμιον κόσμον τῆς ἀνδρείας μορφῆς ἀφαιροῦντες. ὅθεν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερουργεῖν γυναικας παρισταμένας¹¹⁴ ἔχουσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτοὶ γυναιξιν εἰκόασιν¹¹⁵ καὶ τοὺς πλείονας τῶν λαϊκῶν, ὅτε βούλονται¹¹⁶, καθημένους. καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ μυστικὸν ποτήριον ἀποπλύνοντες μετὰ τὴν μετάληψιν ἐπ' ἐδάφους ἐκχέουσι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης αὐτῶν, ὅτε¹¹⁷ βούλονται¹¹⁸, πατεῖν οὐ πεφρίκασι. τοσοῦτον οἶδασι τιμᾶν τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἄγια. εἶτα καὶ ἡμῖν ἐγκαλοῦσι· φεῦ τῆς ἀνοίας, φεῦ τῆς τυφλώσεως. |

[40r]

Et hec a quibus? Ab his certe qui omnem traditionem ecclesiasticam irritant, qui inter sanctum et inquinatum nequaquam distinguunt. Ubi apud ipsos sacrarium quod inter nos altare dicitur? Ubi apud ipsos sacra sedes quam pontifex ascendit? Legant venerandas Maximi voces et abscondantur. Videant qui magis ipsum et suos sermones sequuntur, nos vel illi. Et tamen ipse illuminator Ecclesie, certans pro veritate et recta fide, totum orbem discurrit et maximum tempus in Occidua parte fecit, Rome scilicet et in Affrica, nec quitiā aliud dixisset quam tota Ecclesia tenebat et Christiani omnes. Sed inventores novorum et falsarii fidei ecclesiasticos mores corruperunt atque immutaverunt. Nec mirum ubi et ipsam naturam falsam reddiderunt pro viris femine apparentes, et venera|bilem [40v] ornatum virilis forme auferunt. Unde et sacrificando feminas coactantes habent, nam et ipsi mulieribus similes sunt, etiam plurimi laicorum cum voluerint sedent. Et ipsi mysticum calicem post communionem abluentes loturam in terram iaciunt. Nec terrentur, cum voluntas tulerit, mensam sacram calcare. Tantum noverunt sancta eorum venerari, et ipsi nos accusant. Heu eorum insipientie! Heu execrationis!

COLOSSENSIS: Hec tue turpissime obiectiones quam frivole sint, manifeste videbis si suo ordine ipsas considerare incipiamus. Et primo vellem abs te scire quas vocas 'traditiones ecclesiasticas.'

EPHESINUS: Salvatoris precepta, apostolorum doctrinam, sacrorum consiliorum sententias.

113 ἔθῃ] *supplevimus secundum* Petit 473, 19

114 παρισταμένας] συμπαρισταμένας Petit 473, 23

115 εἰκόασιν] εἰκόασι Petit 473, 24

116 βούλονται] βούλωνται MS

117 ὅτε] ὅ γε MS

118 βούλονται] βούλωνται MS

COLOSSENSIS: Recte locutus es, si ultra ostenderis quas ex his traditionibus Romana Ecclesia spreuit.

EPHESINUS: Si mente repetes, invenies Latinos omnes illas frustrasse. Et primo Salvatoris sententiam: ipse enim dicit Spiritum Sanctum a Patre procedere; vos et de Filio idipsum dici debere affirmatis.

[41r] COLOSSENSIS: O | Ephesinorum pontificem, que philosophia te docuit ut si Filius Spiritum Sanctum a Patre procedere dixerit, id ab ipso solo esse credatur?

EPHESINUS: Cur igitur Filius de Spiritu loquens non a se procedere dixerat, quod profecto in tam oportuno processionis loco tacere non debuerat?

COLOSSENSIS: Fecit certe, cum paulo ante premiserat eundem Spiritum Veritatis esse, et ipse sese Veritatem alibi nominaverat. Satis a se Spiritum procedere docuit, cum post resur(ri)ctionem ab intimo pectore sufflans, “Accipite,” inquit, “Spiritum Sanctum.”¹¹⁹ Quod Cirilus Alexandrinorum presul, pertractans in editionibus super Iohannem, non secus Christum dedisse Spiritum Sanctum tunc asseveravit quam quisque hominum cum “proprium spiritum ex intimis visceribus ad extra effundit.” Unde et ait:¹²⁰

[41v] Τῶν γὰρ φυσικῶν¹²¹ ἀγαθῶν οὐσιωδῶς ὑπάρχων ὁ υἱὸς κοινωνῶς¹²² ἔχει τὸ πνεῦμα κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, καθόπερ¹²³ ἂν νοοῖτο καὶ ὁ πατήρ, οὐκ ἐπακτὸν οὐδὲ ἔξωθεν· εὐήθης γάρ, μᾶλλον δὲ μανικὸν τὸ οὕτω φρονεῖν. ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ καὶ¹²⁴ ἡμῶν | ἕκαστος τὸ ἴδιον ἐν ἑαυτῷ πνεῦμα συνέχει καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐνδοτάτων σπλάγχνων εἰς τὰ¹²⁵ ἔξω προχέει. διὰ γάρ τοι τοῦτο καὶ σωματικῶς ἐνεφύσησεν ὁ Χριστὸς δεικνύς, ὅτι¹²⁶ καθὼςπερ¹²⁷ ἐκ τοῦ¹²⁸ στόματος τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου¹²⁹ πρόεισι τὸ πνεῦμα σωματικῶς, οὕτω καὶ ἐκ τῆς θείας οὐσίας θεοπρεπῶς προχέεται τὸ ἐξ αὐτῆς.¹³⁰

119 Io 20.22.

120 Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Commentarius in Ioannem* II 468, 12–21, ed. Philip Edward Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872; repr. Brussels: Culture and Civilisation, 1965).

121 τῶν γὰρ φυσικῶν] τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς φυσικῶν Pusey 468, 11–12

122 ὁ υἱὸς κοινωνῶς] κοινωνῶς ὁ υἱὸς Pusey 468, 12–13

123 καθόπερ] καθ’ ὃν περ Pusey 468, 13

124 καὶ] om. Pusey 468, 15

125 τὰ] τὸ Pusey 468, 17

126 ὅτι] *supplevimus secundum* Pusey 468, 18

127 καθὼςπερ] καθάπερ Pusey 468, 18

128 τοῦ] om. Pusey

129 ἀνθρωπείου] ἀνθρωπίνου Pusey

130 αὐτῆς] αὐτοῦ Pusey

In his enim que bona naturalia Patris sunt Filius essencialiter communicans, habet Spiritum eo modo quo et Pater ipsum habere intelligitur, non sibi hoc forinsecus additum, nec ab extra adveniens. Obtusum enim, ymo furiosum, est ita sentire. Sed quemadmodum unusquisque nostrum proprium spiritum in se continet et ex intimis visceribus ad extra effundit, propterea et corporaliter ipsum Christus sufflavit, ostendens ut sicut ex ore humano spiritus procedit corporaliter, sic et ex divina substantia id quod ex se est, Deo digne, profunditur.

Ex hoc vides | apertissime qui traditionem Christi evacuant, vel tu et tuorum [42r]
errorum conscii vel Romana Ecclesia que sacris evangelicis vocibus consentanea sentit et predicat.

EPHESINUS: Quia ad superiorem disputationem redire oportebit, si diutius immorabimur, ideo satis est de hoc nunc usque dixisse.

COLOSSENSIS: Et de traditione Christi quam falso locutus es manifeste apparet. Restat si de doctrina apostolorum habeas quo adversus Romanam Ecclesiam mentiaris.

EPHESINUS: De illa ostendam tibi quam apertissime Latini tui transgrediantur. Nonne ad Antiochenorum preces Petrus et ceteri primum Christianorum concilium Ierosolimis coegerunt?

COLOSSENSIS: Sic Lucas in Actibus narrat.¹³¹

EPHESINUS: Nonne post sanctam illam consultationem apostoli omnes dixerunt:¹³² « Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis nihil ultra imponere vobis oneris quam hec necessaria ut abstineatis vos ab immolatis simulacrorum et sanguine et suffocato et fornicatione »? Cur igitur Latini, hoc apostolicum – ymo Spiritus Sancti – preceptum publice irritantes, impudice suffocatum et | sanguinem edunt? [42v]

COLOSSENSIS: Sed si ordinem debite narrationis, Ephesine, consideraveris, reperies mandatum hoc Anthiochenis oportune non ad perpetuam observationem, sed pro ingruentia temporis fuisse indultum. Nam cum magna quotidianaque inter eos qui ex circumcisione et ex gentilitate ad fidem convenerant contentio fieret, ut cessarent iurgia conciliatioque gentilium cum Iudeis augeretur atque pinguesceret, a sanguine et suffocato immolatiis ac fornicatione apostoli Anthiochenis abstinere iusserunt. Prima duo consuetudini et voto Iudeorum satisfecerant, alia duo suspicionem ab ipsis Iudeis de gentilibus abstulerunt salutique credentium nationum acute providerant. Vides causam

¹³¹ Act 15,1–2.

¹³² Act 15,28.

iniiecti oneris? Hec cum cessarunt oportuit et sanctionem illam ex parte defecisse.

[43r] EPHESINUS: Videris mihi velle immolatis et fornicatione posse Christianorum quemlibet uti sine offensa. Si quidem observantia sanguinis et suffocati, que veteri institutione | vetita sunt, pretereuntibus Anthiochenorum iurgiis aboleri debuit, eadem ratione et immolatum et fornicatio cessante contentione redire debuerunt. Aut igitur utrumque solutum est post illamurbationem aut neutrum dispensari debuerat.

COLOSSENSIS: Ego hanc tuam partitionem facile admitterem, si cetera quoque in illis prohibitis paria forent, quod inveniri non potest. Nam suffocatum et sanguis sola Mosaica institutione esui humano interdicta sunt. Immolatis autem vesci et fornicatione corpus polluere ipsi nature et rationi non medio cre adversantur, cum primum ad ydololatriam pertineat, alterum procreationi prolis et eius recte educationi quam plurimum officiat. Vagus enim concubitus illa non patitur. Sed de traditionibus patrum quicquam adversus Romanam Ecclesiam quo tuum errorem ostendas?

[43v] EPHESINUS: Non errorem, sed publicam veritatem. Nonne patres nostre religionis statuerunt nullo die Sabbati preter unum qui | diei resurrectionis proximus est ieiunandum fore? Quomodo autem Latini hanc patrum sententiam transgredi ausi sunt?

COLOSSENSIS: Nullius generalis concilii decretum invenies quod Sabbatum ab abstinentia¹³³ solverit, sed consuetudo apud quasdam nationes invaluit ut illum diem solutum haberent. Observationes autem que non a sanctis apostolis nec sacris conciliis tradite sunt libere fiunt, ita ut pro locorum varietate teneri aut dissolvi habeant. Testis est Ambrosius Mediolanensium presul, qui ait se Rome solere Sabbato ieiunare, quod Mediolani non observabat.¹³⁴

EPHESINUS: Quomodo dicis hanc Sabbati cerimoniam liberam esse volentibus, cum et canones apostolorum id precipiant et sexta sacra synodus¹³⁵ eosdem canones suscipiendos fore decrevit?

[44r] COLOSSENSIS: Canones qui dicuntur a sanctis apostolis editi suspecti habiti sunt et inter apocriphos libros inclusi. Unde et inter ecclesiasticam observantiam ab LXXXV in LX, a LX. in quinquaginta excerpti sunt. Testes sunt Zepherinus et Leo, Romani pontifices, quorum primus sextam synodum longe ante precesserat, Leo vero ipsam sequutus est; suscepti tamen a sacra synodo Sabbati observantiam non habent. Quomodo enim latuisset Agathonem, Sedis

¹³³ abstinentia] astinentia a.c. s.l. MS

¹³⁴ As reported in Augustinus, *Epistola ad Ianuarium* (no. 54), c. 2, n. 3 (PL 33, coll. 200–201).

¹³⁵ Actually the Council in Trullo, 692.

Apostolice presulem, qui sexti universalis concilii acta dictaque probavit, ut non itidem apud occiduas ecclesias servaretur?¹³⁶

EPHESINUS: Quia observatio Sabbati non nimium obest si modo sincero animo fiat, ideo de ipsa longiorem sermonem facere non arbitror necessarium. Dicito itaque si quid habes ultro quo recte respondeas.

COLOSSENSIS: Habeo plurima et omnia certe verissima, quibus tuas iniectas calumnias in Romanam Ecclesiam aperte refellam. Sed prius scire abs te cupio: cum dicas Latinos inter sanctum et inquinatum aut prophanum non discernere, quid per illud 'inquinatum' intelligis? Estne aliquid tale a natura indictum quod 'immundum' | recte dicatur, vel totum voluntati legis dimissum [44v] est ut inter ea que usui humano accedunt quedam immunda habeantur?

EPHESINUS: Extat utrumque. Nam et in prima rerum procreatione natura inquinata quedam permisit et legis institutione immunda alia dicuntur; horum quodlibet testimonio litterarum sacrarum accepimus.

COLOSSENSIS: Falleris, Ephesine, nec parvam iniuriam ipsi nature inicis. Nam si in opificio suo inquinatum aliquid frequenter natura reliquisset, id aut nescia faceret aut quasi debilitata impurum a mundo segregare non potuisset. Quorum neutrum de ineffabili illa potentia dici potest. Deinde, non vides quantum illi sententie adverseris que ait:¹³⁷ "Vidit Deus cuncta que fecerat et erant valde bona"?

EPHESINUS: Ego huic tue responsioni nihil obiicio. Est Noe vir iustus et illa etate Deo precipuus, qui certum te faciet, cum divino precepto de mundis septena et septena, de immundis vero animalibus | duo et duo in archam [45r] conduxerat.¹³⁸

COLOSSENSIS: Illa animalia et omnia sui generis munda et vetita¹³⁹ natura expollivit adeo ut nullam peccati labem anime ingerant. Verum, cum ad usum hominum et sacrificiorum oblationem generata videantur ea que post primi patris peccatum noxia et virulenta hominibus facta sunt, immunda vocitantur. Horum nature, usus, complexiones, proprietates plurimum inter se distant. Alia vero, quia turpi cibo vesci solent aut in sacris gentilium magna veneratione habebantur, velut immunda a sacrificiorum oblatione abiecta sunt. Morali etiam intelligentia quedam animalium immolationi concedebantur; alia penitus interdicta sunt. Nihil autem istorum est quod a Latinis ignoretur. Nam cum

136 Zepherinus, 199–217; Leo IX, 1049–1054; Third Council of Constantinople, 680–681; Agatho, 678–681.

137 Gn 1.31.

138 Gn 7.2.

139 vetita] uitita MS

secularium ac divinarum litterarum apprime edocti sint, tam publica institutio eos latere non potuit.

[45v] EPHESINUS: Videris mihi omnino non intellexisse que dicere volui, cum Latinos accusaverim non discernere inter sanctum atque prophanum. Illud | non ideo dixi ut ipsos naturas animalium aut Mosaicam constitutionem ignorare crederem, sed quia confuso quodam et indifferenti usu omnia illa admittunt. Nam et ranas, et testudines, lumaces, serpentes, et quicquid aliud turpissimum illis occurat quod eis edacitas suggerat immundissime comedunt. Id et eorum sacris admittere solent; siquidem canem nemo prohibet ne templum ingrediatur, et Iudeo ac infideli cuilibet patent ianue ecclesiarum. Que omnia a bonis moribus et vera religione aliena sunt.

COLOSSENSIS: Debuisti saltem a beato Petro, apostolorum principe, doctior fieri, qui, cum multorum animalium congeriem sibi oblatam abhorreret, affirmans se numquam aliquid immundum manducasse, ab angelo correptus est:¹⁴⁰ “Que Deus,” inquit, “benedixit, tu immunda non dicas.” Que igitur natura munda nobis produxit, ea quorum¹⁴¹ “nihil reiiciendum,” sed [46r] “cum gratiarum actione” percipienda sunt, quemadmodum Paulus Tito | scripserat.¹⁴² Que suscepta per os non coinquinant hominem, sicut Salvator decrevit.¹⁴³ Quomodo tu, illius universalis ac sanctissime institutionis impudentissime spretor, infamare audes? Ingressus autem canis et infidelis in templum nullum contagium afferunt. Canis enim non introducitur, sed cum a vestigiis domini sui difficile evelli possit, ingrediente ipso sepe, et ille occulte dillabitur. Infidelis autem, si ut audiat, interroget, discat, ingrediatur, admitendus est, cum illo suo accessu ipse ecclesiam non polluat, sed magis pollutam animam purgare atque salvare possit. Quam igitur sapientissime Latini prophanum a sancto decernant iam audisti.

Veniamus ad alias tuas insanas obiiectationes. Dicis, « ubi est apud eos altare? » quasi nec ubi. Ego puto tantam fuisse animi tui cecitatem ut etiam usque ad optutus corporis se diffuderit quod in plurimis anime morbis accidere solet. Sed dicas, Ephesine, cum in Italiam profectus es, vidisti illic | [46v] aliquod templum?

EPHESINUS: Plurima, magnificentissima ac ornatissima.

140 Act 10.12–15, 11.6–9. Act 11.9: « Quae Deus mundavit tu ne commune dixeris. » Cf. Augustinus: « Quae Deus mundavit, tu immunda ne dixeris » (Sermo 149, 7, 8; Sermo 266, 6; In Psalmum 103, enarratio 111); *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville*, c. 32 (English version): « Non dicas immunda, quae Deus mundavit. »

141 ea quorum] *pro* eorum?

142 Recte 1 Tim 4.4.

143 Mt 15.17–18.

COLOSSENSIS: Quid putas illic Latinos agere?

EPHESINUS: Orare, sacramenta offerre, sacrificare?

COLOSSENSIS: Recte existimas. Putasne ibi aliquem esse locum sacrificio ascriptum, vel quorsum voluntas duxerit, ibi licet hostiam offerre?

EPHESINUS: Puto esse aliqua loca decreta sacrificio eminentiora ac digniora, in quibus tam venerandum sacramentum confici debeat.

COLOSSENSIS: Cum illa decreta loca, ut dicis, nullo alio nomine apud nostros et tuos quam 'altaria' appellentur, quanta est tua insipientia ut tam facile aut tuam ignaviam aut reconditum odium toti orbi significes?

EPHESINUS: Sentio plane non ad meam intelligentiam,¹⁴⁴ sed ad vocis significationem te sermonem vertisse. Non nego Latinos altaria habere, sed non tali decentia sacratissimo corpori dedicata colunt et ornant sicut decet cultores Dei. Deberent enim clausa esse nec aliquem ingredi licere nisi qui sacro ordi[ni] [47r] aggregatus est; populus autem a longe astare et divina aspicere; quod a tuis minime servatur.

COLOSSENSIS: Video te iterum ad veterem umbram reversum. Vis ut altare undique concludamus ita ut omnia astanti populo secreta et incognita sint, quemadmodum et Iudeis preceptum est. Sed quia illa tanquam umbra preterierunt, servari amodo nephas est.

EPHESINUS: Intelligere nequeo quo pacto sacrarii claustrum figura¹⁴⁵ fuerit aut quomodo preterierit.

COLOSSENSIS: Nosti, ut opinor, in tabernaculo federis¹⁴⁶ archam fuisse constructam ex lignis sethin, qua quedam erant recondita, que integritatem Christi significarent. Archa composita erat ex ligno sethin, purissimo genere arborum, quod rectissime Dominico corpori adaptatur. Propterea et auro mundo celata fuerat. In illa servabatur manna, quod animam Christi preferebat plenam divinitate et sapientia. Habebat virgam Aaron, que pontificii Christi dignitatem ostenderat. Erant et | tabule legis, quia tunc venturus erat qui legem longe [47v] prestantiorem ferre debebat. Sed quia omnia hec non solum vulgo, sed etiam integerrimis ac sapientissimis viris aliena erant, cortina archam tegebat que aptissime ex quatuor coloribus consuta est: ex bysso retorta, que viros ab omni carnis voluptate purgatos indicat; iacincto, que sapientie signum est; ex purpura, qua intelleguntur ii qui constantissime passionibus carnis obsistunt; ex cocco bis tincto, ut etiam si qui amore Dei proximique ardebant illius nihilominus misterii vel tenuem eruditionem habuerint. Sed cum iam omnia illa preterierint, quid necesse est cortinam in templo habere aut illum in mediis

144 Intelligentiam] intelliogentiam *a.c.* MS

145 figura] *pro* factum?

146 Ex 25.10–12; Nm 4.4–14; Heb 9.4.

[48r] archanis concludere, cuius humanitas atque benignitas nobis manifeste apparuit, sicut Paulus Tito scripserat?¹⁴⁷ Preterea, meministi superiore disputatione fuisse ostensum substantiam panis virtute Dei in verbis Salvatoris suscepta extremo prolatio[n]is articulo in corpus Dominicum verti. Sacerdos autem eo momento gestu corporis ostendit Christum adesse. Quo agnito, populus astans genu, ore, pectore, manu, leni oratione sacra veneratur. Si igitur numero fideles plurimi sunt in illo concluso saccello, omnes eum videre non possent ad quem adorandum convenerant. Patet itaque aspectus undique cerimonias afferre volentibus.

EPHESINUS: Nusquam memini me apud nostros legisse que iam loqueris. Quod si ita est quemadmodum dicis, nihil in eis video quod iure reprehendi possit.

[48v] COLOSSENSIS: Et ideo summa obiurgatione dignus es qui temere accusare venisti ea que iure reprehendi non possunt. Facta igitur debita purgatione patentissime falsitatis, accedamus ad reliquas tuas iniurias. Ubi est, ais, apud illos sacra sedes quam pontifex ascendit? Non hec diceres, Ephesine, nisi aliquis nequam spiritus te possideret. A quo si permissus fuisses, cum in Italia versabaris, scrutari loca sacra, ecclesias, oratoria, cenobia, religionis acrimoniam, vivendi ordinem, contemplationis sublimitatem, diceres profecto vel homines illos in terris extra corpus totam sanctimoniam Christiane religionis complexos, vel ipsam sanctimoniam humana forma suscepta inter homines in seculo isto versari. Domumque repetens, esses eorum acerrimus predicator. Sed ignorare non debes apud Latinos esse decentissimas sedes pontificibus sanctis devotas. Habent et ipsi vestes sacras, vasa pretiosissima misteriis divinis dedicata; habent ysodum; habent omnia ad celebritatem sacrificii aptissima ac ornatissima. Que singula, si quis describere vellet, opus proprium postularent.

EPHESINUS: Dicas ex iis paucissima. Facile enim ex eorum descriptione reliqua quoque percipiemus.

[49r] COLOSSENSIS: Pontifex, cum hostiam Deo oblaturus est, sacrarium sive gazophilatium ingreditur, ubi psalmos ad illud officium destinatos cum orationibus que pontificalibus vestibus coaptantur legere incipit, cum interim ministri ipsum vestire gestiant. | Et calciamenta pedum plantis applicant, pedes caligis vestiunt, ligulis ipsas pedibus astringunt. Calciamenta incarnationem Christi nobis insinuant, iuxta illud:¹⁴⁸ "In ydumeam," hoc est inter gentes, "extendam calciamentum meum," videlicet notam faciam incarnationem meam. Calige animam, que indissolubli unionis connexionione divinitati

147 Tit 3.4.

148 Ps 59.10.

copulatur, hec est ligula illa de qua Iohannes testatus est, dicens:¹⁴⁹ "Non sum dignus solvere corrigiam calciamenti eius." Habet amitum in capite galeam, spem salutis. Tunice vero albe usus munditiam mentis et corporis signat. Propterea et cingulo corpori applicatur, ut illa munditia corporis non fluctuetur more continentorum, sed quod ad temperantiam pontifex summo studio festinare curet, cuius illa precipua dignitas est ut a voluptate carnis non solum non super(e)tur, sed ne agitetur quidem. Subcinctorium fidem designat, sicut Ysaïas xi^o capitulo scripsit.¹⁵⁰ Stola iugum evangelice predicationis indicat. Vestitur | tunica Christum immitans, qui inconsutibili veste usus est; hec in [49v] pontifice integritatem evangelice eruditionis significat. Extrema vestium dalmatica ponitur lata et longa, docens pontificis sapientiam non rerum aut temporum angustiis coartari, sed ubique et semper fore effundendam. Chirotece manus illius ab omni turpi munere tuentur. Anulus Ecclesie subarrationem, baculus auctoritatem ipsius ostendit. Extremo thiara capiti eius apponitur, que excellentiam Christi in terris pontifici collatam docet; hec ideo bicornis est quia utriusque testamenti intelligentiam antistes habere debet.

Hoc modo ornatus, cum locum immolationis accedit, precedunt turiferarii lumen gestantes. De quo Ysaïas:¹⁵¹ "Surge illuminare Iherusalem, quia venit lumen tuum." His proximus est subdiaconus, ferens apostolorum et prophetarum codicem qui adventum Christi pro temporum varietate predicaverunt. Post hunc accedit et pontifex, utroque latere sustentans, sacerdote scilicet | atque levita, ut Salvatorem Veteris et Novi Testamenti testimoniis venisse credatur. Is, ut sese non prorsus ab omni labe criminis alienum ostendat, ante altare publica quadam confessione se peccatorem fatetur. Deinde erectus appropinquat altari, in quo, peractis debitis cerimoniis, ascendit pontificalem cathedram decentissimis paramentis ornatam, ubi sedet donec clerus que ad ysodum pertinebant expleverit. Postea surgens religiosissimo ordine peragit ea que ad populi illuminationem, oblationem sacrificii, et gratiarum actionem attinent. Hec enim tria altaris administratio continet. Taceo in hac parte orationes, petitiones, supplicationes, et obsecrationes que ipse vel elevata voce vel secum tacitus celebrat, nam illa alterius negotii sunt. [50r]

EPHESINUS: Hec omnia illi misterio decentissime adaptantur. Sed nil eorum vidi nec aliquis fuit qui me de iis prudentiorem faceret.

COLOSSENSIS: Quantum igitur in hac parte errasti iam vides. Veniamus ad alias | tuas ineptias. [50v]

149 Lc 3.16.

150 Is 11.5.

151 Is 60.1.

EPHESINUS: Si afferre testem in medium virum sapientia et sanctitate plenum ineptum sit, nescio quod inter disputantes fieri possit quod aptum accommodatumque dicatur.

COLOSSENSIS: Quod beatissimum Maximum quasi in dedecus Romane Ecclesie nobis legendum obieceris, recte id fecisti, quod te factum ire optaveram. Ipse enim tuo mucrone mox ferieris et testis tuus te insipientissimum arguet.

EPHESINUS: Hoc certe nullo modo facturus est.

COLOSSENSIS: Dicas, Ephesine, quis illum veritatis predicatorem acerrimum a Constantinopolitana urbe depulit?

EPHESINUS: Hereticorum rabies qui unam voluntatem et operationem in Christo affirmabant.

COLOSSENSIS: Inde depulsus, quo tandem confugerat?

EPHESINUS: Romam, ubi et plurimum etatis sue consumavit.

COLOSSENSIS: Putasne ipsum, cum Romam veniret, veros Christiane religionis cultores et intemeratam Ecclesiam invenerit?¹⁵²

[51r] EPHESINUS: Sic credere necesse est. Quomodo enim ad Romanam sedem confugisset, | nisi ipsam ab omni labe erroris mundam agnovisset?

COLOSSENSIS: Si igitur Romani cultum ita divinum corripissent, sicut tu clamitas, quo pacto ille errorum expugnator constantissimus cum ipsis diu vixisset aut tantam religionis corruptellam litteris et sermonibus non arguisset? Sed diuturnus ille convictus ostendit ipsum omnem morem Romane Ecclesie approbasse. Quod et alio modo ostendit, cum iniecta calumnia¹⁵³ quorundam tuorum quod Romani in predicando Spiritum Sanctum a Patre et Filio procedere duo principia affirmarent, ipse sapientissime eosdem Romanos per epistolas ad quendam Marinum excussasset.¹⁵⁴ Nec dicere poteris hos ritus postquam beatus Maximus Romam adventaverat fuisse celebratos. Nam annales Romanorum pontificum docent illos vetustissimos et ab ipso apostolorum principe originem habuisse. Quantum igitur testis tuus te veracem ostenderit
[51v] iam vides. Deinde et mendacem ostendit, | cum dicas Latinos Catholice fidei et ecclesiasticorum morum fuisse corruptores.

Veniamus ad alias tuas impudicas calumnias. Dicis ipsos naturam et ve⟨ne⟩randum ornatum virilem falsificasse, cum pro viris mulieres appareant. O impudicum pontificem atque indoctum philosophum, quid te impulit ut ad tam turpem palestram descendisses?

EPHESINUS: Inhonesta barbe abrasio.

152 invenerit] *sic* MS

153 iniecta calumnia] iniectionem calumniam MS

154 Maximus Confessor, *Ad presbyterum Marinum* ... (PG 91, 134D-136B).

COLOSSENSIS: Potuisses profecto de illa pillorum congerie modeste disputare et non velut leno in divino cultu mulieres inducere. Sed oportebat prorsus ut illud a te fieret. Nam cum in superiori disputatione te blasphemum, iniquum, indoctum, mendacemque ostenderis, restabat quod et muliebri molitie te corruptum fatereris, ut quasi ex omni criminum genere te infectum omnes intelligant. Dicis Latinos irritare naturam quod pilo pillum abiiciant?

EPHESINUS: Dixi idemque repeto.

COLOSSENSIS: Hanc pillorum densitatem cui nature officio tribuis?

EPHESINUS: Digestioni. | Nam cum ipsa natura rerum artifex alimentum [52r] receptat, mirifico quodam opere purum ab impuro secernit egestumque rursum quorsus meatus attraxerit, abiicit, et velut onus membris in extimam partem depellit.

COLOSSENSIS: Pilli e(r)go de numero eorum extant que natura tanquam superflua abiicit.

EPHESINUS: Ita videtur.

COLOSSENSIS: Igitur Latini cum barbam decidunt naturam imitantur?

EPHESINUS: Cogor dicere ita esse.

COLOSSENSIS: Responde ulterius, obsecro: quis eorum naturam ipsam corrumpit, vel ille qui barbam incidit, vel is qui eam servat, imo qui tanquam numen quoddam veneratur et colit?

EPHESINUS: Deduxisti me quo venire cavebam. Sed unum a me scire velis: cum audis naturam quedam in extremam partem corporis abiicere, non ita intelligas ut tanquam ab omni officio ipsa aliena iudicet, sed quod uni administrationi inutile est, alteri operi applicatur, quod in singulis nature negotiis aperte invenies. Pillus igitur, cum interioribus | officiis admoveri non possit, [52v] ad limites corporis emittitur ut tegmentum ac ornamentum sit, quod in animalibus vides. Natura enim gallos, leones, aquilas, densitate pillorum in collo feminas a masculis secrevit. Hoc et in homine servare voluit.

COLOSSENSIS: Videris aliquid erudite dicere, cuius si in considerationem veneris, invenies te omnino errasse. Putas animalia cetera solo sensu moveri, hominem vero tanquam altioris ingenii participem arte et ratione vivere? Hoc ab eruditissimis viris diffinitum dudum accepimus. Animalibus igitur, quoniam ad omnem vite ordinem solus sensus non satis est, sapientissime natura providit, operimento scilicet et ornamento. Homo autem quia per artificium de indumento, per rationem autem de ornamento, solus sibi sufficere potest, ideo ipsum omnium opificem¹⁵⁵ consilio suo reliquit. Dico autem ornamentum non quod ex sago aut serici connexionem vel fucata quadam appositione

155 opificem] opifex MS

[53r] membris hominis ad]movetur,¹⁵⁶ sed ineffabilem illum decorem virtutum que mores componunt, animam illustrant, et ad divinam cognitionem et spem assequendi nexumque insolubilis caritatis mentem attollunt. Latini igitur barbam abradunt sicut et ungues abscidunt et tergunt sudorem, et hoc pro munditia corporis. Nam illa pillorum silva inextricabilis quedam animalia infestissima homini tanquam feras silvestres nutrit et celat. Ad quorum venationem oportet manus, ungues, pectines, venacula vermium illorum, summo studio in nemus illud pillorum immittere. Qui autem et muliebri corruptioni proximi sunt, barbam vino optimo abluunt, odoramentis delibu(u)nt, nocte vero in lecto miserrimum illud onus sacco concludunt, ne pilli compliciti futuris venaculis aditum obstruant, a qua servitute et idololatrica superstitione Latini ratorio¹⁵⁷ parvo mox se liberant.

[53v] Sacerdotibus autem Romane Ecclesie inest et alia quedam | necessitas: siquidem, cum corpus et sanguinem Salvatoris quotidie aut frequentissime sumant, oportet eos ut non solum puram mentem sed et corporis munditiam servant, ne sacramento extraneum quidpiam admisceatur. Quorum neutrum cum tuis facere curas. Taceo quam frequenter tu cum tuis complicitibus, antequam ad altare accedis, mentem per penitentiam purges, cum et ipsum penitentiae nomen tibi et pluribus tuorum ignotum omnino videatur. Et ut corporis spurcitia interiorem immundiciam indicet, pillos superioris labii ad inferioris densitatem demittis. Cumque tempus sumendi sanguinis venerit, intingis pillos, quos mox vino brodio aut cuicumque liquori, quem stomacho ingeris, eos admisces. Qui etiam cadentes in locis fetidis, a pretereuntibus conculcantur. Sic nosti Dominicum sanguinem colere. Sed par est ut sic facias. Non enim [54r] ipsum secus veneraris quam in altari dignam Deo illum¹⁵⁸ ostiam offers. |

EFFESINUS: Si barba ad decorem virilem data non est, videre non possum cur mulieres barbas non¹⁵⁹ habeant.

COLOSSENSIS: Quod in ea corporis parte illa densitate pillorum careant, non ideo fit ut aliquo humano ornamento priventur, sed cum ipsis non tantam vim digerendi in illa parte natura indulserit, ideo humidum illud non tam densum hispidumque emittit. Sunt et alie rationes cur illam corporis partem sagax ipsa natura inberbem reliquit. Vadas. Deus te perdat cum barba tua, qui me ad tam obscuram disputationem venire coegisti.

156 ad]movetur] ad]moventur MS

157 ratorio] rosario MS

158 illum] *scil.* panem?

159 non] *mg.* MS

Quod autem dixeris apud Latinos mulieres divinis ministeriis assistere, profecto, Ephesine, aut falleris aut¹⁶⁰ mentiris. Non se ingerunt divinis officiis, sed, contemplantes pietatem divinam in genus humanum reddentesque gratias de tam ineffabili beneficio, astant a longe quantum decens est sexui illi divina inspicere.

Egrotans autem aut valitudinarius quilibet cui adstandum diu pedes non | suppetunt, nonne melius facit sedere in oratorio preces porrigendo quam ab [54v] ingressu ecclesie abstinere velit? Eadem ratione et vos 'cathismata' in oratorii dicitis, ut debilis quisque inter orandum vires reficiat.

Ablutio autem calicis vel manuum consecrantis non in terram effunditur, sicut tu fingis, sed cum in die natalitio Salvatoris liceat sacerdoti ter hostiam consecrare, ne misterii secunda assumptio aliquem extraneum liquorem inveniatur quem prius sumere solebat, sacerdos loco secreto ad hoc officium extracto infundit.

Ex iis igitur que conguessimus, evidentissima ratione constat ut insipientiam et cecitatem quam in Latinis derides in te ipso deflere miserrime habeas. Repetis superiora hoc modo:¹⁶¹

Ἦχεις ἱκανῶς ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ὑπὸ τοῦ σοφοῦ τὰ θεῖα Μαξίμου, ὅτι ἡ μὲν πρώτη εἴσοδος τὴν πρώτην διὰ σαρκὸς παρουσίαν εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον τοῦ δεσπότης δηλοῖ. διὸ καὶ πρὸ αὐτῆς μὲν τὰ προφητικά ἄσματα ἄδονται |, μετ' [55r] αὐτὴν δὲ τὰ ἀποστολικά καὶ εὐαγγελικά λόγια ἀναγινώσκονται. ἡ δὲ δευτέρα εἴσοδος καὶ μεγάλη τὴν δευτέραν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν τυποῖ, καθ' ἣν ἐνταῦθα πάλιν μετὰ δόξης παραγενόμενος ἐπὶ τὸ κρῖναι¹⁶² ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς τοὺς ἀξίους μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ συμπαραλαβὼν¹⁶³ εἰς τὸν ὑπερουράνιον χώρον, ἐκεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν ἔσται διηνεκῶς ἀποκαλύπτων τούτοις τὰ τελεώτερα καὶ θειότερα, κατὰ τὸ φάσκον ῥητόν¹⁶⁴. «ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ». εἴποι δ' ἂν τις καὶ ἕτερον λόγον, ὅτιπερ ἡ μεγάλη εἴσοδος τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν κηδεῖαν ὑποτυποῖ, καθ' ἣν νεκρὸς ὑπὸ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Νικοδήμου πρὸς τὸν τάφον φερόμενος μετὰ μικρὸν ἐξανέστη καὶ τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γνῶσιν ἐπέστρεψεν· οὕτω κἀνταῦθα φερόμενος ὁ ἱερὸς ἄρτος ἀτελής ἔτι καὶ οἷον νεκρὸς μετὰ μικρὸν τῇ τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ πνεύματος ἐνεργείᾳ

160 aut falleris aut] *mg.* MS

161 Marcus Eugenius, *Epistola ad Georgium presbyterum* 3–4 (ed. Petit, 473, 32–474, 21).

162 κρῖναι] κρῖναι MS

163 συμπαραλαβὼν] συμπαραλαμβὼν MS

164 Mt 26, 29

ζωοῦται καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ ζωοποιὸν σῶμα μετασκευάζεται. ταῦτά σοι ἐκ πολλῶν ὀλίγα πρὸς ἀποτροπὴν τῆς ἐκείνων ἀναισχυντίας ἔγραψα.

- [55v] | Satis iam habes ex iis que a Maximo divina sapiente dicta sunt: quod prima ysodus presentiam Domini in mundum istum per carnem significet; propterea et ante ipsam prophetica cantica mox apostolica et evangelica eloquia leguntur. Secunda autem ysodus et magna secunde presentie typus est, secundum quam, iterum cum gloria adveniens ut vivos et mortuos iudicet, dignos secum accipiet ad chorum supercelestem, ubi cum eis in eternum mansurus est, revelans illis ea que perfectiora ac diviniora sunt, iuxta vocem illam: "Quando bibam illud vobis|cum novum in regno Dei." Diceret forte quispiam et aliam rationem: ut magna ysodus exequias Salvatoris nostri figuret, secundum quam a Ioseph et Nicodemo ad sepulcrum delatus post modicum resurrexit et universum mundum ad suam agnitionem convertit. Ex hoc sacer panis imperfectus et quasi mortuus accione vivifici Spiritus post modicum vivificatur et ad ipsum vivificum corpus convertitur. Hec tibi ex multis pauca ad confutationem invecundie illorum perscripsi.
- [56r]

COLOSSENSIS: Latini tuas typicas significationes et debitas cerimonias non accusant.

EPHESINUS: Quid igitur in ipsis est quod eos adeo vehementer offendit?

- COLOSSENSIS: Quod putes non in alio quam in fermentario pane sacramentum Dominicum confici posse. Quod in templo circumeas et invites indoctam plebem idololatriam com(m)ittere. Quod arbitreris in aliis quam in Salvatoris verbis misterium illud perfici. Quod cum illud momentum tam admirabilis conversionis accesserit nullam | omnino venerationem ostendis. Quod in missarum celebrationibus nullum penitus sacrificium offers.
- [56v]

EPHESINUS: Quomodo non vereris hec dicere? Quid igitur expedit nos missales cerimonias agere, si sacramenti confectione caremus?

COLOSSENSIS: Hoc te, Ephesine, latere non debet ut minister sacramentorum Christiane pietatis id intendere habet, quod et Christus in Ecclesia facit, cum sit instrumentum ratione utens seque voluntarie offerat administrationi Ecclesiae. Christus autem, summus sacerdos, et sponsa sua Ecclesia, cum stant in verbis solis Dominicis perfici posse altaris immolationem, quod tu et tui complices omnino negatis, profecto in vobis nullum Eucharistie sacramentum, nulla hostia apud vos immolatur. Hec sunt, Ephesine, que Latini abhorrent, que execrantur, que a finibus Christianis abiicienda iudicant. Non igitur

tu eorum temeritatem confutare potes, sed ipsi tuam inauditam impietatem
refellere | ac iure damnare possunt. Quantum itaque in sacrificio altaris insi- [57r]
pienter et temerarie Latinos argueris iam vides.

Audiamus etiam in alio religionis opere te manifeste mentiri. Ais.¹⁶⁵

Γίνωσκε δέ, ὅτι ὁ ὅρος τῆς ψευδοῦς συνόδου, μᾶλλον δὲ ἡ ματαία καινοφωνία, καθάπερ ἦν ἄξιον οὐδαμῶς παρ' οὐδενὸς προσεδέχθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ τούτῳ συνθέμενοι καὶ ὑπογράψαντες ὡς ἐναγεῖς καὶ προδοταὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ὑπὸ πάντων μισοῦνται, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτοῖς οὐδέπω τῶν ἐνταῦθα συνελειτούργησε. θεὸς δὲ ὁ πάντα δυνάμενος οἰκονομήσειε ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον καὶ διορθώσει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἐξηγοράσατο τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι. φύλασσε τὴν καλὴν παρακαταθήκην τῆς πίστεως, τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας¹⁶⁶ παντελῶς ἐκτρεπόμενος.

Ὁ Ἐφέσου Μάρκος. |

[57v]

Scias autem ut decretum mendacis synodi, imo magis inanis et nova vox, quemadmodum dignum erat, a nemine prorsus suscepta est. Sed et ipsi qui illud composuerunt atque subscripserunt velut inquinati et proditores veritatis odio habentur ab omnibus et nemo eorum qui hic sunt ipsis concelebrat. Deus autem, qui omnium potens est, hec disponat ad utile et dirigat suam Ecclesiam, quam emit proprio sanguine. Custodi bonum depositum fidei, prophanas et vanas voces abiiciens.

Ephesi Marcus.

COLOSSENSIS: Cur audes illam synodum mendacem et eius decretum inane
et inventorium nove vocis nominare? Quomodo fictus aut mendax ille con-
ventus clarissimorum et sapientissimorum virorum esse potuit, ad quem pro
veritatis discussione velut ad magisterium Spiritus Sancti undique evolaverant,
cui Romanus pontifex prefuit, ubi imperator resedit, Patriarcha Ioseph aderat,
tenentes | loca trium reliquorum patriarcharum non defuerunt, plurima quo- [58r]
que multitudo metropolitatum tui generis sua sponte advenerat? Taceo patres
Occidentalis Ecclesie in omni disciplina ac religione eruditissimos. Quid igitur
illi sinaxi defuit ne verax et sancta diceretur? Nec propter te, obstinatissimum
hominem, et quosdam solam umbram religionis habentes debuit tante

165 Marcus Eugenikos, *Epistola ad Georgium presbyterum* 4 (ed. Petit, 474, 20–33).

166 κενοφωνίας] καινοφωνίας *corr.* Petit 474, 31. The Latin translation renders exactly the nice difference between καινοφωνία and κενοφωνία (“new, heretical talk” vs. “empty, foolish talk”).

sanctitatis et sapientie splendor maculari, cum in omnibus illis sacris conciliis aliqui Spiritui Sancto rebelles extiterint. Testis est Arrius, Macedonius, Nestorius, Dioscorus, et ceteri illi heresiarche, qui proprio fisi ingenio a generali omnium illorum patrum diffinitione secesserunt. Preterea, illud decretum inane et novi sermonis fictio esse non potest quod apertis codicibus sancti patres et utriusque generis preceptores in medium produxerunt, ad quod probandum insuperabiles rationes adi(e)cte sunt que te in illis frequentissimis congressionibus mutum reddiderunt. | Ceterum, cum tibi inducie amplissime date sint ut obiiceres quicquid adversus Latinos haberes, aut rationes eorum quas pridem adversus te habuerant confutares, cur nullum huius honestissime partitionis propositum acceptare voluisti?

EPHESINUS: Veritus sum ne in me constanter disputantem manus funestas iniicerent.

COLOSSENSIS: Postea quam in Italiam intrasti cum tuis, nil in Latinis expertus es quod te in hunc terrorem induceret, imo eorum in vos benivolentia, hospitalitas, munificentia maximi apparatus, et cetera humanitatis officia ipsos piissimos et modestissimos docuerunt. Et hec quidem omnibus communia fuerant. Tibi autem singularissimum munus oblatum est, de cuius ingratitude Deus aliquando dignas a te exiget penas.

EPHESINUS: Vellem abste scire illius muneris qualitatem.

[59r] COLOSSENSIS: Meministi, post illas diuturnas disputationes et decretum promulgatum suscriptionibus|que munitum, pontificem maximum et imperatorem consedissee teque summa benignitate et clementia admonuisse ut ab illa tua dyabolica obstinatione recederes annueresque sacri concilii diffinitioni?

EPHESINUS: Memini optime. Sed quid feci ut tali obiurgatione me postea dignum existimes?

[59v] COLOSSENSIS: Quia pollicitus es Constantinopolim petere ubi prefecto patriarcha sententie concilii assentires atque subscriberes. Tu autem, velut illius filius qui ab initio in veritate non stetit, recedens a sacro illo collegio, ad presidia Teuchrorum confugisti, similis illis et forte infidelitate eorum deterior, omnesque has regiones tuis chartulis perditissimis corrumpere studuisti, asserens Latinos mortuum sacrificium Deo offerre; quod umbre Mosayce legis assideant; quod Basilio magno et sapientissimo Maximo contradicant; quod fidem simul et naturam hu|manam corruperint; quod altare apud eos et pontificalis cathedra non habeatur; quod velut mulieribus similes virilem sibi dignitatem auferant; quod mulieres ad sacrorum administrationem admittant; quod sacra eorum nulla veneratione habita sunt; quod Florentinum Concilium inanem et nove fidei diffinitionem ediderit. In quibus omnibus hac nostra congressione explosus et redargutus es, quamquam sint alii patres sapientissimi qui longe

melius atque acutius has tuas mendacissimas calumnias diluant. Agnosce igitur, Ephesine, tuos errores nephandissimos et te non solum sceleris tui peniteat, sed etiam publicis testimoniis te errasse fatearis ut simplitium hominum corda que tuis mendatiis corrupisti saluti sue restituas. Secus et si tu unus ad tot supplitia satis non sis, eterno tamen cum ceteris heresiarchis cruciaberis igne.

Finis. |¹⁶⁷

[6or]

¹⁶⁷ Andreias arciepiscopi Colosensis *add. manu secunda* MS

Notes from a Nominalist in a New Incunabulum by Symphorien Champier

Brian Copenhaver and Thomas M. Ward

Introduction

No incunabulum can be new, of course, but the book described here is a new candidate for that classification: it is a textbook for university undergraduates, an *Introduction to Instruction in Grammar and Logic* by Symphorien Champier (c. 1470–1539).¹ Champier was a physician who spent most of his life in Lyon, publishing about four dozen books, most of them in Latin and mostly about medicine.² Whether the copy of his *Isagoge* described here is an incunabulum will be decided by bibliographers and other experts – not by us. Without doubt, however, this little book is a source of fresh information about Champier's early career and about the contest between scholastic philosophy and the new classicism before and after 1500.

In modern times, the systematic identification of incunabula – books and other items printed before 1501 – goes back to 1822, when Ludwig Hain began to publish his *Repertorium bibliographicum*, which later scholars updated and is now being replaced or extended by the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* (GW) of the Berlin Staatsbibliothek, the *Incunabula Short Title Catalogue* (ISTC) of the British Library, and – most recently – the *Universal Short Title Catalogue* (USTC) hosted by the University of St. Andrews and directed by Andrew Pettegree. In 1827 Hain gave only two titles (4906, 4907) for Champier, and neither is actually an incunabulum. ISTC does not list Champier's *Isagoge*, showing only his *Gateway to Logic and Science* (ic00420000) and *Dialogue on the Destruction of the Magical Arts* (ic00421000) as printed before 1501 – both in or around 1498 by Guillaume Balsarin in Lyon. But entry 0655320N in GW is

1 *Isagoge Simphoriani Champerii in grammaticam disciplinam et logicam cum denotatione realium vanitatum et elucidatione nominalium veritatum*, n.p., n.d., cited here as *Isag*. We thank Robert Black, Isabelle de Conihout, Martin Davies, Jürgen Dinter, William Kemp and Bruce McKittrick for their advice and criticism.

2 Copenhaver, *Symphorien Champier and the Reception of the Occultist Tradition in Renaissance France* (The Hague: Mouton, 1978).

“Champerius, Symphorianus: *Isagoge in grammaticam disciplinam*,” attributed to the printer Jean Pivard in Lyon around 1500. The sole source of the entry is Jürgen Dinter of Antiquariat Jürgen Dinter in Cologne, and no libraries are listed as owning a copy: it was Mr Dinter who generously notified us, in the summer of 2010, of the book’s existence and provided us with photographs.³

However, Mr. Dinter also told us that the Bibliothèque Mazarine in Paris owns a copy (Rés. 27675–6) of the same title by Champier; Mme Isabelle de Conihout, Chief Curator of the Mazarine’s Fonds Ancien, has confirmed this. Further correspondence with Mme de Conihout and Mr Dinter led us to Baudrier’s *Bibliographie lyonnaise*, which dates the Mazarine’s *Isagoge* around 1512 and locates it in Lyon with the publisher Pierre Mareschal. Since this was the only copy of the *Isagoge* known before Mr Dinter’s discovery, and since it was not described as an incunabulum, Champier’s book would not have appeared in any of the standard listings of incunabula from Hain to the *ISTC*, and *GW* lists it only from Mr Dinter’s copy.⁴

The older specialized bibliographies also differ in their treatment of Champier and his *Isagoge*. Ferdinand Buisson’s 1886 compilation of pedagogical books locates it in the Mazarine but gives no date, place or printer. Most important: Paul Allut’s very detailed bio-bibliography of Champier, published in 1859, does not mention it at all. Allut’s silence effectively erased the book from later scholarship on Champier – including the study published by one of us in 1978, based on a dissertation finished in 1970. A closer look at Baudrier – although it is organized by printers and publishers rather than authors and does not, in principle, list incunabula – would have shown what Allut missed.⁵

That was the bibliographical story of the *Isagoge* – as far as we knew – until very recently, when the *USTC* became available online in January of 2014. The *USTC*’s ancestor, which deals only with French vernacular books, was not relevant for Latin books like the *Isagoge*. In addition to the Mazarine copy, the *USTC* lists (as of February 7, 2014) four others, all in Italian libraries: the

3 Ludwig Hain, *Repertorium bibliographicum in quo libri omnes ab arte typographica inventa usque ad annum MD typis expressi ordine alphabetico . . . recensentur* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1827), 1.2.95; *GW*, *ISTC* and *USTC* are online.

4 Henri-Louis Baudrier, *Bibliographie lyonnaise: Recherches sur les imprimeurs, libraires, relieurs et fondateurs de lettres de Lyon au XVI^e siècle* (Lyon: Brun, 1895), 11.473; Sybille von Gültlingen and René Badagos, *Bibliographie des livres imprimés à Lyon au seizième siècle* (Baden-Baden: V. Koerner, 1992), 1.35.43.

5 Copenhaver, *Symphorien Champier*, 11–28; Paul Allut, *Étude biographique et bibliographique sur Symphorien Champier* (Lyon: Scheuring, 1859), 105–7; Ferdinand Buisson, *Répertoire des ouvrages pédagogiques du XVI^e siècle: Bibliothèques de Paris et des départements* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1886), 150.

National University Library in Torino, the Panizzi Municipal Library in Reggio Emilia, the City Library in Arezzo and the Biblioteca Casanatense in Rome. Counting the Dinter book, this would bring the total number of copies of the *Isagoge* now known to six. However, a check with each of the four Italian libraries shows that, while all have copies of other books by the prolific Champier, none owns the book in question: *pro captu lectoris habent sua fata libelli*.⁶

Champier wrote the *Isagoge* for students of grammar and logic at the University of Valence. Founded in 1452, this new center of learning in the Dauphiné came into its own after Champier died, when the great legal scholar, Jacques Cujas, attracted talents like Joseph Justus Scaliger and Jacques Auguste de Thou. Valence – strategically sited on the Rhone, just south of Lyon and west of Grenoble and the Alps – may have started to grow in the 1490s when Cesare Borgia became the city's Duke, and Charles VIII's failed invasion of Italy increased traffic in the region. Meanwhile, nominalists were still battling realists in Paris, where the new classicism had not yet triumphed. Josse Bade (Badius), who read copy for Jean Trechsel in Lyon, also passed through Valence before settling in Paris in 1497. He had traveled in Italy and published Terence, but he also brought out William of Ockham's most important writings in 1494 and 1495, when there were still buyers in France for the charter documents of nominalism.⁷

Some were Champier's students in Valence, perhaps, though we know almost nothing about his teaching there, only that he had already studied in Paris before going south to work "as summoner and humble assistant under the righteous guidance of that reverend man, Raynauld Jean de Fleury, a most expert and skillful master of the liberal arts and very learned in the sources of sacred theology." Master Raynauld – Reginaldus Johannes de Florido – is also a mystery, except that he contributed to a breviary published in Lyon in 1500.⁸

6 Terentianus Maurus, *De litteris*, 1286; *USTC*, 130150, giving no date: however, the online catalogues of the Torino, Reggio Emilia, Arezzo and Casanatense collections show no copies of the *Isagoge*; see also Andrew Pettegree, Malcolm Walsby and Alexander Wilkinson, *Livres vernaculaires français* (Leiden: Brill, 2007–11).

7 Augustin Renaudet, *Préforme et humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494–1517)* (2nd ed.; Paris: Librairie d'Argences, 1953), 285–7, 292, 300; Joseph Cyprien Nadal, *Histoire de l'Université de Valence et des autres établissements d'instruction de cette ville depuis leur fondation jusqu'à nos jours, suivie de nombreuses pièces justificatives* (Valence: Aurel, 1861).

8 *Isag.* 1.1, 3; *Breviarium canonicorum regularium sancti Augustini congregationis sancti Rufi* (Lyon: [Michel Topié], 1500), which is GW 05233.

Who Champier's students were is also unclear: how old they were; what, if any, degrees they were seeking. The *Isagoge* that their teacher wrote for them assumes that they already knew a little logic, at the level of the standard introductions by Peter of Spain and Paul of Venice, but the grammatical theory that Champier starts with is more advanced. The *Isagoge* is the sort of collection that would now be called a 'course reader' – a gathering of loosely related material for intermediate or advanced undergraduates.

The two topics of the *Isagoge* are grammar (parts 2–3) and logic (parts 4–6). The grammatical theory of the first half of the book is modist – the 'modes of signifying' that humanists despised as illiterate and nominalists usually rejected as realist illusions. The logic of the second part of the book is nominalist. In fact, much of it comes verbatim and without attribution from Ockham's *Summa of Logic*. Exactly how and why Champier meant to make a nominalist critique of modist grammar remains to be seen: our hope is that putting his *Isagoge* in print again will motivate philosophers to find the answer to that question and others.

Champier says in his preface – written in a humanist style, more or less, in contrast to the scholastic Latin that follows – that the *Isagoge* has three parts.⁹ But at the end of the book we learn that:

Although it is enough to divide the present work into exactly three parts, as the prefatory letter makes clear, yet because the present work considers some topics that seem not to be included in that division – at least explicitly – the present work can be quite usefully divided into five parts.¹⁰

Moreover, the preceding section on first and second intentions has almost no connection with what comes before it, except that this material is also lifted from Ockham.¹¹ The book seems to have been assembled hastily or clumsily or both: the closing sections may have been tacked on by the publisher to fill space.

The most striking thing about Champier's *Isagoge* is its timing. The *Gateway to Logic and Science* that Allut and other students of Champier have taken to be one of his first two publications is securely dated to October 5, 1498. That book, moreover, is plainly a prelude to Champier's later career as a

9 *Isag.* 1.2–3.

10 *Isag.* 7.1.

11 *Isag.* 6.1–3.

humanist physician who was much taken with the culture of late Quattrocento Italy, especially the philosophy of Marsilio Ficino. The science in the *Gateway* is *physica*, the 'physick' or natural philosophy that was the theoretical basis of medical practice – Champier's future calling and, in all likelihood, what he was studying at Montpellier around the time he wrote the *Gateway*. The logic is just elementary terminology, but not the scholastic kind: Champier takes his logic – explicitly – from the new classicist Aristotelianism of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples. He devotes another part of the *Gateway* to Lefèvre's comments on Aristotle's *De anima* and another to Ficino on the world-soul.¹²

The contents of the *Gateway* confirm that its author was the Champier who went on to become an eminent physician and an impresario of humanist culture. But this was not the Champier who wrote the *Isagoge*, a scholastic manual that shows no sign of any interest in medicine. There is nothing in it but modist grammar and nominalist logic. Furthermore, siding publicly with Lefèvre in the *Gateway* was a declaration of divorce from scholasticism, which is what Lefèvre wanted to displace with his newly elegant Aristotle, informed as much by philology as by philosophy. There is a little classicism in Champier's *Isagoge*, but very little: a mention of Lorenzo Valla; citations of Cicero and Sallust; a passage from Diomedes the grammarian; and the studied prose of the prefatory letter.¹³ The rest of the book is a slog through some very ugly Latin, like this:

Quantum principium est dependens et terminus. Et dicitur terminus obliquus casus qui naturaliter regitur a verbo a parte post, verbum vero respectu eius diceretur dependens. Exemplum ut diligo Petrum, et non tenentur convenire in aliquo accidente. Tamen terminus debet poni in illo casu quem requirit post se verbum quia, si diceretur amo Petri, male diceretur quia dependens et terminus non bene conveniunt quia amo, quod est dependens, vult activum et habet genitivum. Sed debemus dicere amo Petrum ut sit recta locutio.¹⁴

Judging by the latter part of the book, which comes mostly from Ockham, Champier himself may not have written those sentences. He may have taken them from a treatise on modist grammar. But it was Champier who published them for his students. Once he had made a public break with scholasticism in the *Gateway* of 1498, it is all but inconceivable that he could have put his name on a book like the *Isagoge*. Its content, in relation to the *Gateway*, is very

12 Champier, *Janua logicae et physicae* (Lyon: Balsarin, 1498); Renaudet, *Préréforme*, 374, n. 6.

13 *Isag.* 2.19, 23, 37.

14 *Isag.* 2.29.

compelling evidence that he wrote it before the *Gateway* – before October of 1498. That the copy studied here was printed at that time is the natural inference, which is compatible with the physical and circumstantial evidence.¹⁵

Finally, a date as late as 1512 for the Mazarine copy seems problematic – especially if Champier had anything to do with its publication. By that time, the *Isagoge* would have disgraced him with critics like Lefèvre and Erasmus, and by then there were few readers for its outmoded contents. As an introduction to philosophy, the *Isagoge* is a book of the late fifteenth century, not of the new age. In bibliographical terms, however, the story is still a puzzle. Why was the Mazarine copy made with a title page and printer's mark that experts have placed at a point in Champier's life when the contents of his book no longer suited his new persona? That question may never be answered. But we know that Champier travelled frequently in the years just before and after 1512 – to Lorraine, Valence, Paris, Metz, Reims and also to Italy – in circumstances that invited self-promotion: maybe he had a few new copies of the *Isagoge* made to take with him as advertisements for himself.¹⁶

Even if the bibliographical and chronological problems stray unresolved, the *Isagoge* will shed light on a number of issues, larger and smaller: the conflict between scholasticism and humanism; Ockham's continuing influence in French universities; the standing of modist grammar and its relation to logic; the practices of French printers and publishers; and the early stages of Champier's career. We plan to examine these matters at another time, limiting ourselves for now to a provisional publication of this jumbled *Introduction to Instruction in Grammar and Logic*.

Since it would be hard to find an area of late medieval and early modern thought, from the Greek East to the Latin West, that John Monfasani has not visited and improved, almost any topic known to the authors of this tribute would be appropriate to the occasion. Especially honored here, however, are John's charmingly combative and wonderfully productive ventures into the land of the realists and nominalists – distinctively medieval sects – whom

15 Mr. Dinter, in correspondence with Mr. William Kemp of Montreal, informs us that the book's type may be the 65G – Gothic, with 20 lines in 65 mm. – that was in use around 1500. One state of the printer's mark that appears in the Mazarine copy was used by 1499, another by 1503, though it is seen most often around 1512. If the book was printed by Jean Pivard, as indicated by GW, the salient dates are the years of Pivard's recorded activity, 1499–1501, but Pivard may have taken the book over from Balsarin, who printed the first two of Champier's titles listed by Allut – both before 1500.

16 Copenhaver, *Symphorien Champier*, 57–61; above, n. 6.

he found warring in Paris in a document from 1474: in that text, the *nominales* in Paris describe their opponents, the *reales*, as ignoring what the *nominales* study – the properties of terms examined in the latter part of Peter of Spain's *Summulae*, a textbook used since the middle of the thirteenth century. Symphorien Champier, famed until now as a humanist, makes the same medieval complaint in his *Isagoge*.¹⁷

17 Monfasani, *Language and Learning in Renaissance Italy* (Aldershot: Variorum, 2004), 12.232–3, 244.

Edition

Isagoge Simphoriani Champerii
in grammaticam disciplinam et logicam
cum denotatione realium vanitatum
et elucidatione nominalium veritatum
incipiunt feliciter.

1

1. Iniquum esse censui vitioque non parvo datum si quid mentis acie ac serenitate conspexerunt instar servi nequam pectore surdo contineant homines, quid enim dulcius, quid naturae humanae accommodatius quam disciplina. Itaque quid pulchrius, quid viro dignius ac ingenio libero gratius succurrere possit quam doctrina. Non enim latet mortalium quemquam illum Prometheum de limo rudi ac indigesto confinxisse mortales quandoquidem mentes eorum bonis artibus erudit, et quae quemlibet ex illis perficiat summa ope atque vigilantia petere et expetere docuit. Harum vero artium in grammaticis et logicis iacta sunt fundamenta praeclarissima. Quapropter Simphorianus Champerius – quem parisinorum genuit universitas praeclarissima – hoc opusculum edidit suis partibus deductum.

2. Prima est de octo principiis grammatices.

Secunda vero in eisdem rebus et causis quid reales quid etiam nominales sentiant breviter perstringit.

Tertia tandem errata realium in logicis, nominalium rationibus acutissimis, corrigit et ad veritatem reducit.

speech: noun, pronoun, verb, participle, adverb, conjunction, preposition and interjection; but see below, n. 12. See also Geoffrey L. Bursill-Hall, *Speculative Grammars of the Middle Ages: The Doctrine of Partes orationis of the Modistae* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971), 60–1, 286–8; Bursill-Hall in Thomas of Erfurt, *Grammatica speculativa*, ed. and trans. Bursill-Hall (London: Longman, 1972), 35, 98–107. These two books are the most thorough guides to the elusive modist terminology, but a better place to start is Michael Covington, “Grammatical Theory in the Middle Ages,” in *Studies in the History of Western Linguistics*, ed. Theodora Bynon and Frank R. Palmer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 26–34.

Symphorien Champier's introduction
 to instruction in grammar and logic,
 pointing out the falsehoods of the realists,
 shedding light on the truths of the nominalists
 and happily beginning both

1

1. I have thought it harmful and no small concession to error if people, like worthless slaves, keep silent in their hearts something they have observed distinctly and clearly in their minds, for what is sweeter and what better suited to human nature than to teach? What is nobler, then, what worthier of a man and more befitting his good nature than if he can be helpful by giving instruction? For it escapes no mortal that the famous Prometheus fashioned mortals from raw, shapeless mud just by informing their minds with the useful arts, and he showed that any mortal could master them by seeking and striving with utmost effort and attention. But the best possible foundations for these arts have been established in grammar and logic. Accordingly, Symphorien Champier – a product of that most excellent University of Paris – has published this modest little work, the best he could do.

2. The first part is on the eight principles of grammar.¹

Then the second – lightly and briefly – presents what the realists and also the nominalists think about the same issues and problems.

And finally the third, using the most thoughtful arguments of the nominalists, corrects mistakes of the realists in logic and leads back to the truth.

1 The 'principles' in question are *principia constructionis* or perhaps *principia congruitatis* as understood by the modist grammarians. *Constructio* is a syntactic relation between two words, treated as 'constructibles' in a sentence. *Congruitas* is a relation of correctness between such constructibles in a well-formed sentence, as when an adjective 'agrees' with a noun in number, gender and case or a preposition 'governs' a noun in one case but not another. The modists counted four principles of construction, corresponding to Aristotle's
 ← four causes, but Champier's principles are eight, corresponding, roughly, to the eight parts of

3. Hoc munusculum laetus excipiat lector, non enim parum proderit legentibus eum.¹ Ea est instructio, ea sunt rudimenta scholarum liberalium artium almae universitatis Valentiae, in quibus Simphorianus ipse summonitor ac modestus coadiutor vitam degit sub reverentia et determinatione reverendi viri Reginaldi Johannis de Florido artium liberalium peritissimi solertissimique magistri ac sacre theologie rivulis eruditissimi.

Vale

2

1. Cum sint septem artes liberales, scilicet grammatica, logica, rethorica – quae dicuntur triviales – et arismetria, musica, geometria, et astrologia – quae dicuntur quadriviales – triviales dicuntur quasi tribus viis in unum finem tendentes, scilicet in sermonem, aliae quadriviales quasi quattuor viae in unum finem tendentes, scilicet in quantitate. Et quia grammatica obtinet principium, nunc de suis principiis aliqua dicere volumus.

2. Sed quia in omni scientia principia praesupponuntur et nunquam probantur quia – ut dicit Philosophus primo Phisicorum – contra negantem principia non est arguendum cum nulla scientia probet sua principia, quod grammatica non habet probare sua principia probatur: quia sicut geometer se habet ad sua principia, sic grammaticus ad sua; sed geometer non habet probare sua principia, ergo nec grammaticus sua habet probare. Minor patet quia non habet notius illis. Ex praedictis infero aliquas conclusiones.

3. Prima conclusio: grammaticus, ex proprio habitu, non habet disputare contra negantes sua principia; igitur et cetera.

4. Secunda conclusio: Grammaticus non habet solvere quamcumque rationem litigiosam aut sophisticam, sed solum illam quae ex principiis suis aliquid false concludit, quod probatur sic: in arte speciali non exigitur ut solvantur rationes sophisticae quia tales rationes maximum habent defectum, scilicet in forma vel in materia; igitur. . .

1 *se] eum*

3. The reader should be glad to get this little gift, which will be quite useful to those who read it. This is the material – basic lessons for studying the liberal arts in the bountiful University of Valence – on which Symphorien himself has spent his life as summoner and humble assistant under the righteous guidance of that reverend man, Raynauld Jean de Fleury, a most expert and skillful master of the liberal arts and very learned in the sources of sacred theology.

Farewell

2

1. Since the liberal arts are seven, namely grammar, logic, rhetoric – called trivial – and arithmetic, music, geometry, and astrology – called quadrivial – the trivial are so called as being three roads leading to one place, namely to speech, and the others are quadrivial as being four roads leading to one place, namely to quantity. And because grammar comes first, we now wish to make some comments about its principles.

2. But because principles are presupposed in every science and never proved, then – as the Philosopher says in the first book of the *Physics* – since there is no arguing against one who denies principles in that no science proves its principles, it is proved that grammar does not have to prove its own principles: in fact, the grammarian relies on his principles just as the geometer relies on his; but the geometer does not have to prove his principles, so neither does the grammarian have to prove his. The minor premiss is clear because the ‘does not have to’ is better known for the geometer’s principles. From the preceding I draw some conclusions.²

3. First conclusion: the grammarian, on his own part, does not have to dispute against those who deny his principles; therefore, and so on.

4. Second conclusion: The grammarian does not have to solve every niggling or sophistical argument, only one that concludes something falsely from his own principles, which is proved in this way: in a special science there is no need to resolve sophistical arguments because such arguments are the weakest of all, namely in form or in matter; therefore. . . .

2 Arist. *Phys.* 184^b26–5^a20.

5. Tertia conclusio: Ponentes tantum esse tria principia in grammatica non sane percipiunt illa quae continentur in ea: probatur quia nesciunt quid sit determinatio et determinabile, quid sit dependens et terminus, et sic de aliis.

6. *Principium Primum*

Est appositum et suppositum. Et dicitur suppositum illud quod regitur a verbo a parte ante, et denominatur a suppositione grammaticali. Et dicitur suppositio quasi suppositi reductio. Et diffinitur suppositum apud modernos sic: suppositum est signum cui attribuitur verbum tanquam appositum. Et se habent correlative appositum et suppositum, ideo unum diffinitur per alterum, sicut dominus est res habens servum et servus est res habens dominum. Ita dicendum est de apposito et supposito.

7. Nota primo quod nullum sincathegoreuma significatione vel officio potest supponere, nec nullum pronomen pure pronominaliter tentum nec nullum adiectivum adjective tentum nec nullum verbum verbaliter tentum.²

2 *sincathegoreuma*

context; although an *appositum* can be the logical predicate of a proposition, the word is less common in logic than *suppositum*. The modists use *appositum* only for the verb in a noun/verb construction, where the noun is the *suppositum*. In 'white man runs well' – *homo albus currit bene* – the apposit *currit* depends on the supposit *homo*, which requires a third-person, singular verb. Nonetheless, Champier says that in a noun/verb construction, where the noun comes "in front position" in the sentence, it is a supposit 'directed' by the verb, meaning that the noun must be in the nominative case in order to be the verb's grammatical subject. Also, 'suppositing' can be understood as 'putting-in-front' in a theory of grammar that emphasizes the placement and order of words in sentences – despite the loose word-order of Latin. See Robert Black, *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 70–71; Bursill-Hall, *Speculative Grammars*, 60–5, 179; above, n. 3.

- 5 The main logical parts of a proposition are subject, copula and predicate. Terms that can be subjects or predicates linked by the copula ('is') are 'categorematic.' Other terms like 'if,' 'and,' 'but' and 'not' are 'syncategorematic.' Peter of Spain says that "they signify various things, but not . . . things that can be subjects or predicates, so they signify things that are dispositions of those that can be subjects or predicates": *Syncategoremata: First Critical Edition with an Introduction and Indexes*, ed. Lambertus Marie De Rijk, trans. Joke Spruyt (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 38.

5. Third conclusion: Those who claim that there are only three principles of grammar do not have a good grasp of what it contains: this is proved because they do not know what *determination* and a *determinable* are, what is a *dependent* and a *term*, and so on for others.³

6. *First Principle*

This is *apposit* and *supposit*. And that is called a 'supposit' which is directed in front position by the verb, and the name comes from grammatical suppositing. And it is called 'suppositing' as if derived from 'supposit.' And this is how 'supposit' is defined by the moderns: a supposit is a sign to which a verb is attributed as apposit. And the apposit and supposit are related as correlatives, so that one is defined through the other, just as a master is a thing that has a slave and a slave is a thing that has a master. This is the account that we need of apposit and supposit.⁴

7. Note first that no syncategoreuma can supposit by signifying or by function, nor can any pronoun taken purely pronominally nor any adjective taken adjectivally nor any verb taken verbally.⁵

3 Champier objects to three principles, not four, as too few (cf. n. 1). Nonetheless, his choice of the number eight, on the pattern of the parts of speech, probably reflects a nominalist rejection of the view that ontology – perhaps the triad of matter, form and privation or composition – really underlies the structure of grammar, whereas the parts of speech are just words. Champier takes *determinatio*, *determinabile*, *dependens* and *terminus* from the terminology of the modists, who appeal to hylemorphic metaphysics. Of the two constructibles in a construction, one is always 'determinant' and the other 'dependent': in 'Socrates runs,' for example, the second word depends on the first, which determines the second in the relation called 'determination.' But in 'runs well' the second word is determinant and the first 'determinable.' Moreover, in 'I-like Peter,' where *Petrus* is inflected to *Petrum* in Latin, that word is a 'term' as distinct from a different sort of 'principle' (cf. n. 1), like 'Peter' in 'Peter runs,' where 'Peter' is also a *suppositum*: see *Isag.* 2.29, where "an oblique case that is naturally directed by a verb in back position is called a 'term,' but in relation to it the verb would be called 'dependent.'" Note that *terminus* and *suppositum* have quite different meanings in logic: see below, n. 4, and Bursill-Hall, *Speculative Grammars*, 48–55, 60–5, 310–16; Bursill-Hall in Thomas of Erfurt, *Grammatica speculativa*, 35, 72–3, 107; Covington, "Grammatical Theory," 26–34.

4 *Appositum* and *suppositum* are technical terms both in grammar and in logic, where their meanings are quite different. A logical *suppositum* is what a term stands for in propositional

8. Et si aliquis diceret: contra infinitivus potest supponere dicendo legere est bonum, secare est agere, ergo verbum potest supponere; ad hoc dicitur – ut dicit Petrus de Aliaco in suis *Insolubilibus* – quod si ly legere teneatur verbaliter dicendo legere est bonum, ipsa oratio non est congrua sed incongrua. Sed si capiatur nominaliter, tunc est congrua et sensus est lectio est bona, et de secunda sensus est sectio est bona, et cetera.³

9. Notandum secundo quod etiam participia participialiter capta non possunt supponere, nec nulla pars minus principalis si capiatur personaliter potest supponere.

10. Notandum est tertio quod pronomen cum nomine potest supponere. Etiam participium cum substantivo et adiectivum cum substantivo potest supponere – id est, esse suppositum.

11. Notandum est quarto quod obliquus oblique tentus non potest supponere.

12. Et si aliquis diceret: contra dicendo Petrum amare est bonum, ly Petrum est suppositum et est terminus obliquus, igitur obliquus potest supponere; ad hoc dicitur – ut dicit aliquis De Alvernia – quod duplex est obliquus, scilicet obliquus oblique tentus et obliquus rectificatus. Obliquus oblique tentus non potest supponere, et tenetur oblique quando est alius casus a nominativo et regitur a parte post a verbo. Sed obliquus rectificatus, ut est obliquus rectus a verbo a parte ante, bene potest supponere, ut dicendo a patre amatur Iohannes.

3 *sectio*] *lectio*

not a principal part. In logic, 'personal' supposition, as in *Isag.* 5.4, is a property of a term, but Champier uses it here (see *Isag.* 2.18) in the grammatical way, along with tense, number, mood and others as one of the verb's accidental modes of signifying, whereby a verb is either first, second or third person: Bursill-Hall, *Speculative Grammars*, 217, 397.

8 Cases other than the nominative (*rectus*) are oblique or *indirectus*.

9 *Petrum* is a supposit because it is the grammatical subject of the infinitive *amare*, and it is indirect because it is accusative, not nominative. Among the grammatical works attributed to Pierre d'Auvergne (d. 1304) are a *Gloss with Questions on the Doctrinale of Alexandre de Villedieu* and *Grammatical Questions*: see the online *Historische Hilfswissenschaften und Mittelalter* (2005) of the Universität Freiburg Schweiz (http://www.paleography.unifr.ch/petrus_de_alvernia/); also Pinborg, "Semantic Representation in Medieval Logic," in *History of Linguistic Thought*, ed. Parrett, 256, 269–72; and Edgar Hocedez, "La vie et les oeuvres de Pierre d'Auvergne," *Gregorianum* 14 (1933): 3–36.

8. And if someone should say this: on the contrary, an infinitive can supposit when one says 'to-read is good,' 'to-cut is to-act,' and so a verb can supposit; the reply – as Pierre d'Ailly says in his *Insolubles* – is that if the 'to-read' is taken verbally when saying 'to-read is good,' then this statement is not well-formed but ill-formed. But if it is understood nominally, then it is well-formed and the sense is 'reading is good,' and the sense of the second statement is 'cutting is good' and so on.⁶

9. The second point to be noted is that even participles understood participially cannot supposit, nor can any part less than principal supposit if it is understood personally.⁷

10. The third point to be noted is that a pronoun with a noun can supposit. Also, a participle with a substantive and an adjective with a substantive can supposit – can be a supposit, in other words.

11. The fourth point to be noted is that a word in an indirect case taken as indirect cannot supposit.⁸

12. And if someone should say this: on the contrary, when one says 'for Peter to-love is good,' the 'Peter' is a supposit and is an indirect term, and so the indirect can supposit; the reply – as a certain De Alvernia says – is that the indirect is of two types, namely the indirect taken as indirect and the corrected indirect. An indirect taken as indirect cannot supposit, and it is taken as indirect when the case is other than nominative and it is directed in back position by the verb. But a corrected indirect, since it is an indirect directed by the verb in front position, can indeed supposit, as in saying 'by his father is loved John.'⁹

6 Pierre d'Ailly (1351–1420), best known for political philosophy and theology, also wrote about language and logic and opposed the modists from a nominalist point of view; a *Destructiones modorum significandi* is sometimes attributed to him. But Champier cites his *Concepts and Insolubles: An Annotated Translation*, ed. Paul V. Spade (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1980), 59–60; see also John A. Trentman, "Speculative Grammar and Transformational Grammar: A Comparison of Philosophical Presuppositions," in *History of Linguistic Thought and Contemporary Linguistics*, ed. Herman Parrett (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 294–8; William J. Courtenay, "Nominalism and Late Medieval Religion," in *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion*, ed. Charles Trinkaus and Heiko Obermann (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 26–59; Ludger Kaczmarek, ed., *Destructiones modorum significandi und ihre Destruktionen*, 'Bochumer Studien zur Philosophie 9,' (Grüner: Amsterdam, 1994), ix–xli; Jan Pinborg, *Die Entwicklung der Sprachtheorie im Mittelalter* (Copenhagen: Frost-Hansen, 1967).

7 Only the perfect passive participle (like *lectus*), which is an adjective that can be nominalized, is one of the four principal parts of the verb. The present active participle (*legens*) is

13. Sed quamvis ista opinio sit apparens et ex bono intellectu exspeculata, tamen dico quod nullus est obliquus rectificatus. Et causa est quia quando aliquid nomen est terminus obliquus, si ponatur regi verbo a parte ante, tunc desinit esse obliquus, et qui prius erat obliquus nunc per solam transmutationem efficitur rectus.⁴ Exemplo dicendo doceo Petrum, ly Petrum est hic obliquus quia est accusativus obliquus. Sed si ponatur ly Petrum ante verbum infinitivum, sic dicendo Petrum legere est bonum, in ista oratione ly Petrum est casus rectus – puta accusativus rectus.

14. Et si aliquis argueret solus nominativus dicitur rectus, negatur quia omnis terminus rectus a verbo a parte ante dicitur rectus, sive sit genitivus sive accusativus sive dativus sive ablativus sive effectivus, quia omnis rectus regitur intransitive a verbo, et omnis obliquus transitive. Sed sic est quod accusativus rectus a verbo a parte ante; regitur intransitive, ergo dicitur rectus et non obliquus.

15. Et est duplex genitivus: scilicet rectus et obliquus. Rectus est genitivus rectus a verbo a parte ante; genitivus obliquus est genitivus rectus a verbo a parte post. Et sic possumus dicere de accusativo et aliis casibus.

16. Notandum est quinto quod dicendo Petrus et Margarita nigri currunt, hoc Petrus et Margarita nigri est unum suppositum illius verbi currunt. Aliquando est suppositum ex substantivo et adiectivo ut hic, homo bonus currit; aliquando est aggregatum ex pluribus substantivis ut animal asinus currit, animal homo disputat; aliquando ex pluribus pronominibus ut tu et ille curritis, ego et tu disputamus; et isto modo suppositum est unum copulatum ut Petrus cum Guilermo currunt. Et sic patet quod aliquando suppositum est unum complexum, aliquando unum incomplexum, et cetera.

17. Notandum est sexto quod dicendo ego amo, si ly ego capiatur pure pronominaliter, ipsa est incongrua. Sed si capiatur pro re demonstrata – puta partim nominaliter et partim pronominaliter – ipsa est congrua, ut sit sensus ego amo in ego (Petrus vel Iohannes) amo, quia nunquam pronomen potest supponere ratione sui.

18. Et si aliquis diceret: contra, omnia nomina sunt tertiae personae, ergo in verbis primae et secundae personae oportet uti pronominibus tanquam

4 *qui prius*] *quod prius*

13. However, even though that opinion seems plausible and intelligently developed, I still say that there is no corrected indirect. And the reason is that when some noun is an indirect term, if it is placed to be directed by the verb in front position, then it ceases to be indirect, and what was previously indirect is now made direct through the transformation alone. In saying 'I teach Peter,' for example, the 'Peter' here is indirect because the accusative is indirect. But if the 'Peter' is placed before an infinitive verb, as in saying 'for Peter to-read is good,' in that statement the 'Peter' is a direct case – namely, a direct accusative.

14. And if someone should claim that only the nominative is called direct, we deny it because every term directed by the verb in front position is called direct, whether it is genitive or accusative or dative or ablative or effective, because every direct term is directed intransitively by the verb, and every indirect is directed transitively. But it is in this way that the accusative is directed by the verb in front position; it is directed intransitively, so it is called direct and not indirect.

15. The genitive is also of two types: namely, direct and indirect. The direct is the genitive directed by the verb in front position; the indirect genitive is the genitive directed by the verb in back position. And in this way we can describe the accusative and the other cases.

16. The fifth point to be noted is that in saying 'black Peter and Margaret run,' this 'black Peter and Margaret' is a single supposit of that verb 'run.' Sometimes the supposit is made of a substantive and an adjective like this, 'the good man runs;' sometimes it is an aggregate of several substantives like 'the animal donkey runs;' 'the animal human disputes;' sometimes it is made of several pronouns like 'you and he run,' 'I and you dispute;' and in this way the supposit is a single linked item like 'Peter with William run.' And so clearly a supposit is sometimes a single composite item, sometimes a single non-composite item, and so on.

17. The sixth point to be noted is that in saying 'I love,' if the 'I' is understood purely as a pronoun, the statement is ill-formed. But if it is understood as the thing picked out – partly as a noun and partly as a pronoun, in other words – it is well-formed, as is the sense of 'I-love' in 'I (Peter or John) love,' because a pronoun can never supposit by its own account.

18. And if someone should say this: on the contrary, all names are third person, and so with verbs of the first and second person pronouns must be used as the

supposita, ad hoc dicitur distinguendo maiorem. Aut omnia nomina sint tantum tertiae personae, et sic nego; aut sint tertiae non ponendo signum exclusivum, et sic concedo. Ideo dico quod nomina sunt omnis personae. Cum dicat Priscianus in maiori volumine Priscianus vocor, Priscianus est primae personae; Priscianus vocaris, ly Priscianus est secundae; Priscianus vocatur, ly Priscianus est tertiae personae: ergo nomina sunt omnis personae.

19. Et si aliquis diceret quod Priscianus intelligit quod essent omnis personae nomina si iungerentur verbis vocativis et substantivis sed non cum aliis verbis, ad hoc dicitur si haec fuerit opinio Prisciani, non est tenenda sua opinio cum non teneatur in omnibus, ut patet per Laurentium Vallam.

20. Sciendum est circa hoc principium quod appositum et suppositum tenentur convenire in numero, persona, et natura verbi ad hunc sensum – quod tenentur sic convenire quod non disconveniant, quia dicendo Petrus et Katerina albi currunt, illud complexum Petrus et Katerina albi est suppositum, ly currunt est appositum, et tamen non conveniunt in numero nec in persona cum illud complexum nullus sit numeri neque personae. Tamen non disconveniunt, et hoc sufficit.

21. Et si aliquis quaereret quae est causa quare complexum illud est suppositum, causa est quia illud quod potest esse subiectum propositionis vel locutionis apud logicum potest esse suppositum apud grammaticum. Sed complexum potest esse subiectum apud dialecticum ergo suppositum apud grammaticum.

22. *Secundum Principium*

Relativum et antecedens tenentur convenire in genere et numero, id est, si aliqua oratio inveniatur in qua relativum et antecedens conveniant in genere et numero, talis oratio erit congrua. Vel si istud principium intelligatur quod si relativum et antecedens disconveniant in numero vel genere talis erit incongrua, intellectus non est bonus nisi intelligatur de relativo substantiae identitatis non reciproco, et non de relativis accidentis reciproci aut diversitatis.

two books on syntax. The *Institutiones* became authoritative in Western Europe in the ninth century.

11 Valla, *Dialectical Disputations*, ed. and trans. Copenhaver and Lodi Nauta (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 1.2.5–8, citing Prisc. *Inst.* 18.1.6.

supposits; the reply is that the major premiss must be distinguished. Either all names are only third person, and in this way I deny it; or they may be third person if an exclusive sign is not put in, and in this way I grant it. Hence I say that names are of every person. When Priscian in the larger volume says “Priscian I am called,” ‘Priscian’ is first person; in ‘Priscian you are called,’ the ‘Priscian’ is second person; in ‘Priscian he is called,’ the ‘Priscian’ is third person: so nouns are of every person.¹⁰

19. And if someone should say that Priscian understands names to be of every person if they are joined with vocative verbs and the verb ‘to be’ but not with other verbs, the reply is that if this were Priscian’s view, his view need not be held since it is not held in all cases, which is clear from Lorenzo Valla.¹¹

20. Know concerning this principle that the apposit and supposit are taken to agree in the number, person, and nature of the verb in this sense – that they are taken so to agree in that they do not disagree, since in saying, ‘white Peter and Katherine run,’ the composite ‘white Peter and Katherine’ is the supposit, the ‘run’ is the apposit, and yet they do not agree in number or in person since that composite is devoid of number and person. Yet they do not disagree, and this suffices.

21. And if someone should say ask what the reason is why that composite is the supposit, the reason is that what can be the subject of a proposition or expression for the logician can be a supposit for the grammarian. But the composite can be a subject for the dialectician and therefore a supposit for the grammarian.

22. *Second Principle*

A relative and an antecedent are taken to agree in gender and number: that is, if we find some statement in which a relative and antecedent agree in gender and number, that statement will be well-formed. If we understand that principle to mean that such a statement will be ill-formed if the relative and antecedent do not agree in number or gender, this understanding is certainly not correct unless it applies to a non-reflexive relative of substance and identity, and not to reflexive relatives of accident or difference. And relatives of substance are

10 Prisc. *Inst.* 13.18: Priscian, a contemporary of Boethius, was a Greek-speaker born in North Africa who taught grammar in Constantinople. His *Institutiones grammaticae*, an immense grammar of Latin in eighteen books, was divided into the ‘larger volume,’ containing the first sixteen books on parts of speech, and the ‘smaller volume,’ the last

Et sunt ista relativa substantiae ut qui/quae/quod, is/ea/id, ipse/ipse/ipsum quia ista bene tenentur convenire cum antecedentibus aut consequentibus.

23. Et de istis intelligitur principium et non de aliis cum dicat Salustius in Catilinario est locus in carcere quod Tullianum appellatur. Iccirco dicitur quod aliquando relativum et antecedens tenentur convenire inter se in numero et genere et aliquando non, sed cum consequente, ut Cicero in Tusculanis dicit studio sapientiae quae philosophia dicitur, in qua oratione relativum non convenit in genere cum antecedente sed cum consequente. Et hoc sufficit ad hoc ut oratio sit congrua.

24. Sed si aliquis diceret: contra, si relativum conveniat cum consequente et non cum antecedente, erit contra principium grammaticae et esset improprietas inexcusabilis, ad hoc dicitur negando quod esset contra principium quia, quando dicitur quod antecedens et relativum tenentur convenire in genere et numero, verum est nisi conveniat relativum cum consequente. Sed relativum semper convenit cum suo antecedente vel consequente – et non semper cum antecedente. Sed aliquando discordat cum antecedente et convenit cum consequente, ut patet per Alexandrum in sua constructione quando dicit quod quando casus diversorum generum claudunt inter se relativum – qui casus significant eandem rem vel supponunt pro eadem re – hoc relativum poterit assimilari utrilibet, et precedenti vel consequenti, in genere. Et dat exemplum: est pia stirps Yessae, quem Christum credimus esse, quae oratio sic intelligitur, stirps Yessae est pia quem vel quam credimus esse Christum.⁵

25. *Tertium Principium*

Adiectivum et substantivum tenentur convenire ut in pluribus in numero, casu et genere. In persona non ponitur quia nomina sunt omnis personae, ut dixi

5 *strips*

14 Alexandre de Villedieu wrote his influential and durable *Doctrinale* in 1199 (see note 9 above), putting it in verse for easy memorization by the students, not yet of university age, who learned grammar from it and surely found it more digestible than Priscian's immense volumes, even though it covers the same basic principles taught by Priscian and Donatus, assuming the latter as its starting point. Alexandre was also sympathetic to the new logical and philosophical approach to language: *Doctrinale*, l. 1443–5; cf. Rom. 15:12; and Black, *Humanism*, 72–80.

those like 'who,' 'he' and 'this,' masculine, feminine and neuter, because those are correctly taken to agree with antecedent or subsequent words.¹²

23. And the principle is understood of those and not others when Sallust says in his *Conspiracy of Catiline* "there is a place in the prison that is called the Tullian." This is why they say that a relative and antecedent are sometimes taken to agree with each other in number and gender and sometimes not, but with a subsequent word instead, as when Cicero in the *Tusculans* says "the study of wisdom which is called philosophy," in which statement the relative does not agree in gender with the antecedent but with the subsequent word. And this suffices for the statement to be well-formed in this case.¹³

24. But if someone should say this: on the contrary, if a relative agrees with a subsequent word and not with the antecedent, this will be contrary to a principle of grammar and would be an inexcusable violation of usage, the reply to this would be to deny that it is contrary to a principle because, when we say that the antecedent and relative are taken to agree in gender and number, this is true unless the relative agrees with a subsequent word. But a relative always agrees with its antecedent or a subsequent word – and not always with the antecedent. But sometimes it disagrees with the antecedent and agrees with a subsequent word, as Alexandre makes clear in his construal when he says that "when cases in different genders include a relative between them – and these cases signify the same thing or supposit for the same thing – this relative can be assimilated in gender to either," whether the preceding or the subsequent word. And he gives an example: "this is the devout root of Jesse, whom we believe to be Christ," which statement is understood to mean "The root of Jesse is the devout one whom or which we believe to be Christ."¹⁴

25. *Third Principle*

Adjective and substantive are taken to agree for the most part in number, case and gender. Agreement in person is not claimed because names are of every person, as I said in discussing the first principle. But since adjective and sub-

12 Ordinary school logic classifies relatives as reflexive, non-reflexive and of substance, accident, sameness and difference; see Peter of Spain, *Tractatus, Called Afterwards Summulae logicales: First Critical Edition from the Manuscripts with an Introduction*, ed. Lambertus Marie De Rijk (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1972), 8.2–3, 16. 'Relative' and 'antecedent' are not parts of speech, however. But the pronoun that is a relative is a part of speech: on this pattern, Champier's second principle fits a taxonomy based on parts of speech, and likewise for the remaining principles: see above, n. 1.

←13 Cic. *Tusc.* 1.1.7; Sall. *Cat.* 55.3.

in primo principio. Sed cum adiectivum et substantivum ut in pluribus sunt nomina, ideo bene conveniunt in persona et nunquam disconveniunt. Ideo non tenentur convenire cum non possint disconvenire.

26. Notabiliter dicitur ut in pluribus quia adiectivum non tenetur convenire cum suo substantivo semper in numero, neque in genere, neque in casu quia aliqua est oratio congrua in qua adiectivum et substantivum disconveniunt in numero et casu, ut dicendo una sororum, ly una et sororum disconveniunt in casu et numero. Aliquando in casu disconveniunt tamen est congrua, ut iste est bonus inter fratres, iste est unus de fratribus. Et ideo adiectivum et substantivum aliquando disconveniunt in solo casu, ut video duas virginum, aliquando in solo numero, ut virginitas unius sanctorum. Ideo istud principium habet veritatem isto modo, si adiectivum et substantivus conveniunt in numero, casu, et genere, oratione est congrua. Non tamen sequitur: disconveniunt in aliquo illorum, ergo est incongrua. Sed bene valet consequentia: conveniunt in illis accidentibus, ergo est congrua.

27. Nota quod duplex est adiectivum: scilicet, substantiale, ut sensibile, rationale, aliud accidentale, ut albus alba album.⁶

28. Item, nota quod ad hoc, ut oratio sit congrua, non requiritur quod res significata per adiectivum realiter conveniat rei significatae per substantivum, nam istae sunt orationes congruae: homo est incorruptibilis, homo est rudibilis, equus est risibilis, anima est alba. Et sic de isto principio.

29. *Quantum Principium*

Quantum principium est dependens et terminus. Et dicitur terminus obliquus casus qui naturaliter regitur a verbo a parte post, verbum vero respectu eius diceretur dependens. Exemplum ut diligo Petrum, et non tenentur convenire in aliquo accidente. Tamen terminus debet poni in illo casu quem requirit post se verbum quia, si diceretur amo Petri, male diceretur quia dependens et

6 *ratione*

whinny (*hinnibilitas*) in horses and to bray (*rudibilitas*) in donkeys: Peter of Spain, *Summ.* 1.13, 17; 2.3.

stantive are names for the most part, they therefore agree in person and never disagree. Thus, since they cannot disagree, they are not taken to agree.

26. It is notable that this is said 'for the most part' because an adjective is not always taken to agree with its substantive either in number or gender or case in that a statement can be well-formed when its adjective and substantive disagree in number and case, as in saying 'one of the sisters,' the 'one' and the 'sisters' disagree in case and number. Sometimes they disagree in case yet the statement is well-formed, as in 'that's the good one among the brothers' or 'that's one of the brothers.' And in this way adjective and substantive sometimes disagree only in case, as in 'I see two of the virgins,' sometimes only in number, as in 'the virginity of one of the saints.' So that principle has the truth in this sense: if adjective and substantive agree in number, case, and gender, the statement is well-formed. This does not follow, however: they disagree in some one of these, so it is ill-formed. But this inference is certainly good: they agree in these accidents, so it is well-formed.

27. Note that the adjective is of two types: namely, substantial, like 'the-sensible' and 'the-rational,' and the other is accidental, like 'white' in three genders.

28. Also, note that for the statement to be well-formed, it is not required that the thing signified by the adjective really agree with the thing signified by the substantive, for these statements are well-formed: 'man is incorruptible,' 'man is brayable,' 'the horse is risible,' 'soul is white.' So much for this principle.¹⁵

29. *Fourth Principle*

The fourth principle is *dependent* and *term*. And an oblique case that is naturally directed by a verb in back position is called a 'term,' but in relation to it the verb would be called 'dependent.' An example is 'I-like Peter,' whose words are not taken to agree in any accident. Yet the term must be put in the case that the verb requires after it because, if one were to say 'I-love of-Peter,' it would be said badly, the fact being that the dependent and the term are not in proper

15 All and only humans laugh, but the ability to laugh – *risibilitas* in scholastic Latin – is
 ← not the essence of humans but their property or *proprium*: likewise for the ability to

terminus non bene conveniunt quia amo, quod est dependens, vult activum et habet genitivum. Sed debemus dicere amo Petrum ut sit recta locutio.

30. *Quintum Principium*

Quintum principium est specificans et specificabile, et dicitur specificans nominativus casus qui naturaliter regitur a verbo copulativo a parte post. Et verbum copulativum dicitur specificabile, ut sunt verba substantiva et eorum vim habentia. Verbum substantivum est illud quod significat generaliter – praecise esse vel fieri existere vel est praecise. Unitivum praedicati cum subiecto, hoc est significat quandam compositionem quam sine extremis non est intelligere.

31. Notandum est quod – secundum Alexandrum de Villa Dei – verba passiva retinent vim copulandi sicut verba substantiva, et hoc in constructione. Etiam verba neutra absoluta habent vim copulandi similes casus, ut ambulo rectus. Et fere omnia verba – secundum ipsum – habent vim verborum substantivorum: ut dicendo amor pius, ita dicere possumus amo pius. Sed magis est in usu de passivis et neutris absolutis. Ideo retinent similem naturam copulandi cum verbis substantivis, tamen non retinent omnino eandem naturam cum illis substantivis. Et ideo talia verba constituunt istud principium.

32. Notandum secundo quod verba activa non constituunt hoc principium – ut aliqui dicunt.⁷ Et causa est quia non copulant similes casus, quia si sint activa volunt activum, ut sunt ista: voco, dico, nomino, appello, nuncupo. Et alia quinque sunt passiva et volunt ablativum a parte post, ut sunt ista: vocor, dicor, nuncupor, nominor et appellor. Et congrue dicitur voco te Petrus et vocor a te Petrus, et intelligitur hoc nomine Petrus nam ly Petrus in illis

7 activa] vctīa

17 What Champier has in mind here is unclear. The modists use *species* as distinct from *figura* to discuss how meanings are related as original and derivative in cases like 'hill' and 'hilly,' such that a *species* is a sequence of meanings and the *figura* is the corresponding sequence of forms: Bursill-Hall, *Speculative Grammars*, 150–60; and *Isag.* 3.7, n. 28, on *figura* in a different sense.

18 Alexandre, *Doctrinale*, ll. 1074–7.

agreement since 'I-love,' which is the dependent, needs an active term and has a genitive. But we must say 'I-love Peter' for the expression to be correct.¹⁶

30. *Fifth Principle*

The fifth principle is *specifying* and *specifiable*, and the nominative case that is naturally directed by a copulative verb in back position is called 'specifying.' And the copulative verb is called 'specifiable,' like the verb 'to-be' and those having that force. The verb 'to-be' is the one that signifies universally – 'to-be' itself or 'to-become,' 'to-exist' or 'is' itself. Uniting a predicate with a subject, this 'is' signifies some composition that cannot be understood in the absence of extreme terms.¹⁷

31. It should be noted – according to Alexandre of Villedieu – that passive verbs retain the effect of coupling like verbs 'to-be,' and this is in his construal. Separate neutral verbs also have the effect of coupling similar cases, like 'upright I-walk.' And almost all verbs – according to him – have the force of verbs 'to-be': as we say 'devout I-am-loved,' so we can say 'devout I-love.' But this is done more with passive and separate neutral verbs. In this way they retain a property of coupling like that of verbs 'to-be,' yet they do not invariably retain the same property as those verbs 'to-be.' And this is how those verbs support this principle.¹⁸

32. Note next that active verbs do not – as some say – support this principle. And the reason is that they do not couple similar cases, because if they are active they want an accusative case, as do these: 'I-call,' 'I-say,' 'I-name,' 'I-address,' 'I-designate.' And the other five are passive and want an ablative case in back position, as these do: 'I-am-called,' 'I-am-said,' 'I-am-named,'

16 For *dependens* and *terminus*, see *Isag.* 2.5 and n. 3. When Champier indicates that a genitive is not 'active,' he is not confusing the active and passive voices, ordinary features of verbs, with cases, like the genitive, which are features of nouns and adjectives; instead, he tells us at *Isag.* 3.2 what he has in mind: active and passive modes of signifying, as represented by opponents of the modists. According to the modists, just as modes of understanding (*intelligendi*) differ as active (a mental act, like perceiving) or passive (what is understood by that act, like a concept), so do modes of signifying (*significandi*) differ in the same way. A *dictio*, which is a word that has no grammatical features, becomes a grammatical part of speech only when it gets a mode of signifying, which can be analyzed as active v. passive, like a meaning's expression v. its content: Bursill-Hall, *Speculative Grammars*, 102–6, 174; Bursill-Hall in Thomas of Erfurt, *Grammatica speculativa*, 32, 38,

← 41–7.

orationibus tenetur materialiter. Et sic verbis vocativis activae vocis convenit natura verborum activorum, et sic sunt verba activa.⁸ Et verbis vocativis passivae vocis convenit natura verborum passivorum, et sic sunt verba passiva. Tamen aliquam naturam habent specialem inquantum sunt vocativa.

33. Et diffinitur sic verbum vocativum: verbum vocativum est quod significat verbaliter actum vocandi, et potest specificari per nomina propria et appellativa. Exemplum quando exspecificatur per nomina propria ut voco Petrus.⁹ Exemplum quando per appellativa ut haec verba: vocatur rosa; domus mea domus orationis vocabitur.

34. *Sextum Principium*

Sextum principium est determinatio et determinabile, et dicitur determinatio adiectivum et determinabile dicitur substantivum, ut magister bonus. Item adverbium respectu verbi vel participii dicitur determinatio, et participium vel verbum dicitur determinabile, ut possibiliter currit, amat bene. Et istorum adverbiorum quaedam sunt adverbia temporis, quaedam loci et sic de singulis.

35. *Septimum Principium*

Septimum principium est coniunctio et coniungibile, et sunt coniungibilia dictiones per coniunctiones coniunctae, ut Petrus et Andreas currunt. Et coniunctiones sunt quae coniungunt unam partem cum alia, et sunt multiplices: aliae sunt disiunctivae, ut vel, aut; aliae copulativae, ut et; aliae causales, ut quia; aliae temporales, ut quando; aliae conditionales, ut si; aliae rationales, ut ergo.

36. *Octavum Principium*

Octavum principium est disponens et disponibile. Praepositio autem appellatur disponens, casus autem cui deservit vocatur disponibile, ut vado ad Franciam, vado ad Flandriam. Et istarum praepositionum quaedam deserviunt

8 *vocis] versis*

9 *expecificatur*

20 *Isag.* 2.5 and n. 3; and for other senses of *determinatio* and *determinabile*, see Alain De Libera, "De la logique à la grammaire: Remarques sur la théorie de la *determinatio* chez Roger Bacon et Lambert d'Auxerre (Lambert de Lagny)," in *De Ortu Grammaticae*, 'Studies in the History of the Language Sciences,' ed. Bursill-Hall et al. (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1990), 209–226.

'I-am-addressed,' and 'I-am-designated.' And statements are well-formed that say 'I-call you Peter' and 'I-am-called by you Peter,' understood as the name 'Peter' since the 'Peter' in these statements is taken materially. And the property of active verbs agrees with vocative verbs in the active voice, and thus the verbs are active. And the property of passive verbs agrees with vocative verbs in the passive voice, and thus the verbs are passive. They have a special property, however, inasmuch as they are vocative.¹⁹

33. And the vocative verb is defined as follows: a vocative verb is one that signifies verbally the act of addressing, and it can be specified by proper and designating names. When specified by proper names, for example, it is like 'I-call "Peter."' When it is specified by designating names, it is like these verbs: 'it-is-called "rose,"' 'my house will-be-called "the house of speaking."'

34. *Sixth Principle*

The sixth principle is the *determinant* and *determinable*, and the adjective is called the determinant, the substantive the determinable, like 'good teacher.' Also, in relation to a verb or a participle an adverb is called the determinant, and the participle or verb is called the determinable, like 'possibly he-runs,' 'she-loves well.' And some of these adverbs are adverbs of time, some of place, and so on for each.²⁰

35. *Seventh Principle*

The seventh principle is the *conjunction* and *conjoinable*, and the words conjoined through conjunctions are the conjoinables, like 'Peter and Andrew run.' And the conjunctions are the words that join one part with another, and there are several kinds: some are disjunctive, like the indifferent 'or' and exclusive 'or'; some are copulative, like 'and'; some are causal, like 'because'; some are temporal, like 'when'; some are conditional, like 'if'; and others are inferential, like 'therefore.'

36. *Eighth Principle*

The eighth principle is the *disposing* and *disposed*. 'Disposing' is the preposition's designation, but the case that it takes is called the 'disposed,' like 'I-go to France,' 'I-go to Flanders.' And some of these prepositions take the accusative case, like 'at' and 'before'; some the ablative, like 'from' and 'without'; while

← 19 Champier seems to use 'passive' here both in the ordinary sense, to label one of a verb's voices, and also in the modist sense described above in n. 16.

accusativo casui, ut apud, ante; quaedam ablativo, ut a, absque; aliquae utrique, ut in, sub, super. Et diffinitur sic praepositio apud Dyomedem:

37. Praepositio est pars orationis quae complexa aliam partem orationis significationem eius mutat.¹⁰ Vel supponitur, ut mecum; aut verbum praecedit, ut praefero, perfero; aut adverbium, ut indocte; aut participium, ut praecedens; aut coniunctionem, ut absque; aut se ipsam, ut circumcirca. Praepositiones tam casibus serviunt quam loquelis aut loquelis et casibus.¹¹ Coniunguntur aut separantur aut coniunguntur et separantur: coniunguntur ut di- dis- diduco distraho; separantur ut penes apud. Coniunguntur et separantur ceterae omnes. Ex quibus in- et con- praepositiones si ita compositae fuerint ut eas statim *s* et *f* littera sequatur, plerumque producuntur ut insula infula; consimiliter sunt confessio et infectio.

38. Nota quod

praepositioni accidunt casus. Sunt autem qui putant praepositioni accidere figuram quia sunt praepositiones simplices ut abs, compositae ut absque – ordinem quia sunt compositivae

ut penes, subiunctivae ut binis casibus feruntur, accusativo duntaxat et ablativo.¹²

39. Et sic sufficiant dicta de principiis.

3

*Contra reales sequuntur
argumenta cum positionibus eorum.*

1. Postquam superius dictum fuit de principiis, nunc causa amicitiae et pietatis – quam pietatem et amicitiam circa iuvenes gratia Paracliti habebant – propter aliqua mirabilia quae ab ipsis imaginabantur, et eis docebant

¹⁰ *Propositio*

¹¹ *loquelis et aut*

¹² *pene*

others take either case, like 'in,' 'under' and 'above.' And the preposition is defined by Diomedes as follows:

37. A preposition is a part of speech which, having linked with another part of speech, changes its signification. Either it comes afterward, like 'me-with'; or it comes before a verb, like 'before-carry' and 'through-carry'; or it comes before an adverb, like 'in-sufferably'; or a participle, like 'before-going'; or a conjunction, like 'in-that'; or itself, like 'round-around.' Prepositions apply to cases as well as words, or to words and cases. They or conjoined or separate or conjoined and separate – conjoined like 'de-' and 'dis-' in 'deduce' and 'distract,' separate like 'in the power of' or 'in the abode of.' All others are conjoined and separate. Of these, if the prepositions 'in-' and 'con-' make composites so that the letter *s* or *f* comes right after them, many words like 'insight' and 'infighting' are produced, and 'confession' and 'infection' are similar.²¹

38. Note that

cases occur with prepositions. There are some, however, who think that structure affects the preposition because there are simple prepositions like 'with' and composites like 'without' – also that order affects them because they can take both positions,

like 'within,' or come afterward in two cases only, the accusative and ablative.²²

39. And this is enough to say about the principles.

3

*Following Are Arguments against the Realists
along with Their Own Positions.*

1. Having said the foregoing about the principles, now for the sake of friendship and duty – the duty and friendship that they used to have for young

²¹ Diom. *De arte grammatica*, ed. Heinrich Keil in *Grammatici Latini* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1855–80), 408–9: Diomedes wrote his grammar around 400 CE. Several of the English examples, impossible to translate literally from Latin, are very loose approximations.

²² Ibid.

quae de facto non sunt ponenda in rerum natura. Et isti qui talia docent reales nuncupantur. Sed false nuncupantur reales, nisi dicantur reales de reor, reris, quod idem est quod imaginor, imaginaris, et ita potius debent dici imaginatores, nam faciunt imagines fictas et non veras. Ideo ponuntur in praesenti libro eorum imagines sive imaginationes cum argumentis nominalium, et primo in grammatica.

2. *Realis* – Modus significandi duplex est, scilicet passivus et activus. Modus autem passivus est proprietas rei secundum quam res per vocem significatur. Modus autem activus est proprietas vocis sibi attributa per intellectum, mediante qua proprietate vox significat rem vel proprietatem rei.

3. *Nominalis* – Nullus est modus significandi passivus, ergo nullus erit activus. Consequentia valet quia unum non potest esse sine alio.¹³ Maiorem probo et hoc sic. Secundum te in isto nomine Petrus, significans Petrum, est quaedam proprietas qua significatur Petrus, et istam proprietatem dicis esse modum significandi passivum. Vocetur ergo illa proprietas *b*, et tunc quaero utrum illa proprietas significetur per aliam proprietatem, ab illa *b* distinctam, vel per seipsam sic quod nulla alia proprietas requiratur ad hoc quod significetur.¹⁴ Non potest dari primum quia esset processus in infinitum. Si secundum detur, igitur eadem ratione Petrus potest significari sine tali proprietate quia non est maior ratio quod ista proprietas possit significari sine alia proprietate quia Petrus non dependet, aliquo modo dependentiae, ab illa proprietate cum ista proprietas dependat ab alia. Iccirco non est necesse ad habendum proprietatem rei ponere modum significandi passivum.

4. Ideo ponitur haec conclusio: nullus est modus significandi distinctus a voce vel a proprietate rei; patet quia nulla dictio est nomen vel verbum per tales modos significandi; sed praecise est aliqua vox nomen quia subordinatur

13 *unum potest*

14 *ab illa distinctam*

presents them, quotation marks are not used here. On passive and active modes in modist theory, see above, n. 16.

25 *Isag.* 2.5 and n. 3 on dependence.

26 [Pierre d'Ailly,] *Destructiones modorum significandi*, ed. Kaczmarek, 7, 87.

people by the grace of the Paraclete – because of some marvels that were imagined by them, they were also teaching the young what cannot really be claimed about the world of nature. And those who teach such things are called ‘realists.’ But they are falsely named realists, unless they are called that from ‘I reckon,’ ‘you reckon,’ which is the same as ‘I imagine,’ ‘you imagine,’ meaning that they should be called ‘imagers’ instead, for they produce concocted images, not true ones. In this book, then, their images or imaginings are presented along with arguments of the nominalists, starting with grammar.²³

2. *Realist* – A mode of signifying is of two types, namely passive and active. Now the passive mode is a property of a thing whereby the thing is signified by a word. But the active mode is a property of the word attributed to it by the intellect, by means of which property the word signifies a thing or a property of a thing.²⁴

3. *Nominalist* – There is no passive mode of signifying, so there will be no active mode. The inference is good because one cannot exist without the other. This is how I prove the major. According to you, in that name ‘Peter,’ signifying Peter, is a certain property by which Peter is signified, and that property you say to be a passive mode of signifying. So let that property be called *b*, and I ask whether that property is signified by another property, distinct from *b*, or by itself such that no other property is required for what is signified. The first cannot be granted because it would be an infinite regress. If the second were granted, then for the same reason Peter can be signified without such a property because there is no better reason for that property to be signified without the other property since Peter does not depend, in any mode of dependence, on that property since it depends on another. To get the property of a thing, then, there is no need to posit a passive mode of signifying.²⁵

4. Hence, this is my conclusion: there is no mode of signifying distinct from the word or from the property of a thing; this is clear because no utterance is a noun or a verb through such modes of signifying; instead, some word is a noun

23 Champier puns on *realis* and *reor*, treating the latter as a synonym of *imaginor*; cf. Valla, *Disputations*, ed. Copenhaver and Nauta, 1.9.36.

24 [Pierre d’Ailly], *Destructiones modorum significandi*, ed. Kaczmarek, 7–8. Champier takes his material verbatim from this nominalist polemic, but he seems not to intend to quote it. Likewise, since the many subsequent passages that come verbatim from this source,

← from Bonaventura and – most frequently – from Ockham are not quotations as Champier

conceptui qui est nomen, et aliqua est verbum quia subordinatur sibi conceptus verbi.¹⁵

5. *Realis* – Nota quod infinitivus potest supponere si ponatur ante verbum, et causa est quia est unum equivalens in supponendo ut dicendo secare est agere. Hic secare est suppositum. Et est aliud equivalens in reddendo suppositum, et est oratio infinita ut te dare elemosynam est bonum.¹⁶ Aliud est vox materialiter capta, ut doceo est verbum. Aliud est oratio infinita per istam coniunctionem quod, ut quod deus est in caelo verum est.

6. *Nominalis* – Verbum non potest reddere suppositum verbo. Sed infinitivus est verbum, ergo non potest reddere suppositum verbo. Maior patet quia idem in specie non reddit suppositum sibi ipsi. Etiam suppositum se habet ut materia, verbum se habet ut forma, ergo verbum non potest supponere verbo. Unde tantum repugnat verbo infinitivi modi reddere suppositum quantum aliis verbis supplet si infinitivus capiatur verbaliter.¹⁷ Si vero infinitivus capiatur nominaliter, tunc bene reddit suppositum, et est nomen de facto et casus rectus – ut sit sensus amare est agere, id est amatio est actio vel amans est agens. Sed si capiatur verbaliter, ipsa est incongrua. Similiter est dicendum de aliis equivalentibus.

7. *Realis* – Figura est vitium aliqua ratione excusatum.

8. *Nominalis* – Nullum vitium ratione excusatur cum vitium opponatur rationi, et unum oppositum non excusatur per reliquum. Probatur sic a simili. Sicut est in theologia, sic et in grammatica. Sed in theologia nullum vitium ratione excusatur, ergo nec in grammatica. Iccirco dicimus quod in grammatica nulla

15 *tales modo*

16 *redendo... ut est*

17 *supple.*

28 Champier's wording is nearly identical with Bonaventura's, where the saint's topic is *figura* in the rhetorical and theological sense. But in a grammatical context, commenting on Priscian, Robert Kilwardby says something close: *Est autem figura constructionis improprietas proveniens in ordinatione constructibilium rationabiliter dicta*. See Bonaventura, *Comm. in sent.*, dist. 11, dub. 4; and Mary Sirridge, "Robert Kilwardby: Figurative Constructions and the Limits of Grammar," in *De Ortu grammaticae*, ed. Bursill-Hall, 322–3, 333, on Kilwardby and Petrus Elias, who treat *figura* as grammatical but not in the modist way described above in n. 17.

precisely because it is subordinated to the concept that is the noun, and some word is a verb because the concept of the verb is subordinated to it.²⁶

5. *Realist* – Note that an infinitive can supposit if put before a verb, and the reason is that this is one equivalent way to supposit, as in saying ‘to-cut is to-act.’ Here ‘to-cut’ is the supposit. And there is another equivalent for producing a supposit, and this is an infinitive phrase like ‘for you to-give alms is good.’ Another is a word understood materially, like “‘I-teach’ is a verb.’ Another is an infinitive phrase using the conjunction ‘that,’ like ‘that God is in heaven is true.’²⁷

6. *Nominalist* – A verb cannot produce a supposit for a verb. But an infinitive is a verb, so it cannot produce a supposit for a verb. The major is clear because an item that is the same in species does not produce a supposit for itself. Also, the supposit acts as the matter, while the verb acts as form, so a verb cannot supposit for a verb. Hence, if the infinitive is understood verbally, producing a supposit is as repugnant to a verb in the infinitive mode as it is complementary to other verbs. But if the infinitive is understood nominally, then certainly it produces a supposit, and in effect it is a noun and the direct case – like the sense of ‘to-love is to-act’ or, in other words, ‘loving is acting’ using participles or process-nouns. But this is ill-formed if understood verbally. The same must be said of the other equivalents.

7. *Realist* – A figure is an error excused for some reason.²⁸

8. *Nominalist* – No error is excused for a reason since an error is the opposite of a reason, and one opposite is not excused by the other. The proof from likeness is as follows. As it is in theology, so it is in grammar. But in theology no error is excused by a reason, so it is not excused in grammar. On this point, I say that in grammar there is no figure, if figure is understood as an error of some

27 *Isag.* 2.6 and n. 4 on *suppositum*. But Champier uses ‘material’ as in logical supposition, when a term stands for a word, spoken or written: see *Isag.* 5.2. In the alms-giving example, since *dare* is an infinitive, ‘infinitive clause’ is correct, but there is no infinitive in the God example. In French or English, a that-clause (*que*-clause) or a prepositional phrase with an infinitive can replace an infinitive clause: ‘that Socrates thinks is good’ or ‘for Socrates to think is good.’ Although classical Latin does not use *quod* as English and French use *that* and *que*, this construction was normal in the Latin of the universities of
← Champier’s day.

est figura, si figura capiatur pro aliquo vitio. Sed si figura capiatur pro aliquo modo loquendi brevissimo ratione ornatus, bene est figura, et tunc temporis erit proprietas et non improprietas.

9. Aliae opiniones realium reprobantur in principiis, et sic sufficiat de grammatica. Nunc ad logicam pergamus ut ostendamus errata realium.¹⁸

4

Errata realium.

1. *Realis* – Humanitas differt ab homine realiter, et causa est quia humanitas tantum significat naturam specificam, homo autem addit ultra differentiam individualement.¹⁹

2. *Nominalis* – Contra arguo sicut se habent homo et humanitas sic Sortes et Sorteitas. Sed Sortes nullam rem significat distinctam formaliter nec realiter quae non significetur per hoc nomen Sorteitas, nec econverso. Ergo homo non significat aliquam rem quin significetur per hoc nomen humanitas, nec econverso. Probatio a simili, quia si alterum illorum nominum – Sortes et Sorteitas – aliquid significaret quod non si significetur per alterum, vel illud est natura specifica, et manifestum est quod illa significatur aequaliter per utrumque vel per neutrum, aut alias esset materia vel forma vel compositum vel accidens, quae omnia negantur ista; vel esset differentia individualis quam ponunt, et hoc dici non potest.²⁰ Ergo relinquitur quod nihil significatur per hoc nomen Sortes quin per hoc nomen Sorteitas. Et sic ista conceditur: Sortes est Sorteitas, ergo etiam homo est humanitas. Ideo infero talem conclusionem: homo est humanitas. Et tamen non omnis homo est humanitas quia Christus, filius Dei, est homo et tamen non est humanitas. Et Sortes homo est et tamen est humanitas.

¹⁸ *reprobatur*

¹⁹ *Realis* om.

²⁰ *Aliquid significarent*

as related to another individual word in a two-word 'construction' (above, n. 3), Ockham's first book is the right locus of comparison. However, Champier may have been using a commentary on Ockham or, more likely, a digest like the one given by Prantl in nn. 68–70 below. *Sortes* is the conventional form of 'Socrates' in scholastic Latin, and *Sorteitas* is an abstract noun formed on that word.

sort. But if figure is understood as a very brief way of speaking whose reason is ornament, then figure certainly exists, and in that case it will be proper to time and not improper.

9. Other opinions of the realists are rejected in the principles, and this suffices for grammar. Now let us move on to logic, in order to point out the mistakes of the realists.

4

Mistakes of the Realists.

1. *Realist* – Humanity differs really from a human, and the reason is that ‘humanity’ signifies only the nature of the species, whereas ‘a human’ adds an individual difference besides.

2. *Nominalist* – I argue the contrary, that a human stands to humanity just as Sortes stands to Sorteity. But ‘Sortes’ signifies no formally or really distinct thing that is not signified by the name ‘Sorteity,’ nor the reverse. Therefore ‘man’ does not signify any thing that is not signified by the name ‘humanity,’ nor the reverse. The proof is from likeness, because if either of these names – ‘Sortes’ and ‘Sorteity’ – signifies something that is not signified by the other, then either that is the nature of the species, and it is obvious that it is signified equally by both or by neither, otherwise it would be matter or form or a composite or an accident, which all are denied; or else it would be the individual difference that they posit, and this cannot be said. So it remains that nothing is signified by the name ‘Sortes’ that is not signified by the name ‘Sorteity.’ This is conceded, then: Sortes is Sorteity, so a human is also humanity. I draw that conclusion, then: a human is humanity. And yet not every human is humanity since Christ, the son of God, is a human and is not humanity, nonetheless. Sortes too is human, however, and is humanity.²⁹

29 William of Ockham, *Summa logicae*, ed. Philotheus Boehner, Gedeon Gal, and Stephen Brown (St. Bonaventure NY: Franciscan Institute, 1974), 1.7: this begins a series of verbatim borrowings from Ockham, continuing through *Isag.* 6.2 near the end of the book. Champier’s main source is the first book of the *Summa logicae*, where Ockham examines terms before moving to propositions in the second book. But Ockham’s exposition tracks Aristotle’s *Categories*, giving Champier an opening to reject realist ontology piece by piece, as he proceeds through substance, quantity, relation and the other predicaments. Since the object of modist grammar is always an individual word, a ‘constructible,’

3. *Realis* – Universale habet esse a parte rei extra intellectum, et illud universale est una natura communis quae est in omnibus suis singularibus: puta, haec natura communis est realiter in Petro et formaliter distinguitur ab eo.

4. *Nominalis* – Omne quod est in Petro est unum numero. Sed natura communis non est unum numero, ergo non est ponenda ultra natura communis in ipso. Ultra, omnis natura communis compatitur secum multitudinem. Nihil quod est in Petro compatitur secum multitudinem, ergo nihil quod est in Petro est natura communis. Consequentia patet in CAMESTRES. Ultra arguitur: sequeretur quod aliquid de natura Christi erit miserum et dampnatum quia illa natura communis, existens realiter in Christo et in dampnato, erit dampnata, quia in malo Divite. Hoc autem est absurdum. Igitur universale non est ponendum in singularibus. Item universale non potest poni aliquid extra essentiam individui, et per consequens componitur individuum ex universalibus, ergo erit universale magis quam singulare. Sed hoc absurdum est dicere.

5. *Realis* – Propria passio realiter distinguitur a suo subiecto, et est propria passio aliqua res inhaerens suo subiecto cui est proprium.

6. *Nominalis* – Si tua opinio esset vera, sequeretur quod istae propositiones – homo est risibilis, equus est hynnibilis, asinus est rudibilis – possent esse falsae cum Deus possit omnem rem creatam facere sine alia (saltem priorem sine posteriore) cum sit articulus quod Deus possit separare omnia illa quae inter se differunt realiter et separatim conservare. Tunc ponatur quod Deus separet risibilitatem ab homine. Deinde destruat risibilitatem homine existente. Tunc homo erit et tamen non erit risibilis – quod est impossibile.

7. Ideo dico quod proprium sive propria passio est unum universale. Et est quaedam intentio, praedicabilis adaequate et intransmutabiliter in quale, cognotans affirmative vel negative aliquid extrinsecum sibi quod importatur per subiectum. Non tamen oportet quod illud extrinsecum sit semper aliqua res extra animam, existens realiter in rerum natura. Sed aliquando sufficit

33 The nominalist contradicts what the realist Scotus says in *De primo principio*, 1.8: “The prior according to nature and essence can exist without the posterior, but the reverse is not true.” Ross Inman, “Essential Dependence, Truthmaking and Mereology, Then and Now,” in *Metaphysics: Aristotelian, Scholastic, Analytic*, ed. Lukas Novak et al. (Piscataway NJ: Transaction, 2012), 78–84; above, n. 15.

3. *Realist* – A universal has existence involving extra-mental reality, and that universal is a common nature which exists in all its singulars: to illustrate, this common nature really exists in Peter and is formally distinguished from him.³⁰

4. *Nominalist* – Everything that is in Peter is one in number. But a common nature is not one in number, so a common nature is not be posited in him additionally. Besides, every common nature accepts a plurality along with itself. Nothing that is in Peter accepts a plurality along with itself, so nothing that is in Peter is a common nature. The inference is clear in CAMESTRES. Another argument: it would follow that something of Christ's nature will be afflicted and damned because that common nature, really existing in Christ and in a damned person, will be damned, because it is so in the wicked Dives. But this is absurd. Therefore, a universal is not to be posited in singulars. Also, a universal cannot be posited as something outside an individual's essence, resulting in an individual composed of universals, so the universal will be more than singular. But this is absurd to say.³¹

5. *Realist* – A proper passion is really distinguished from its subject, and a proper passion is a thing inhering its own subject, of which it is a property.³²

6. *Nominalist* – If your opinion were true, it would follow that these propositions – 'man is risible,' 'the horse is whinnible,' 'the donkey is brayable' – could be false since God can make any created thing without another (except the prior without the posterior) because it is doctrine that God can separate, and separately preserve, all the things that really differ from one another. Then let it be posited that God separates risibility from man. Next let him destroy the risibility in an existing man. The man will then exist and yet will not be risible – which is impossible.³³

7. Hence I say that a property or proper passion is a single universal. It is also a kind of intention, adequately and inalterably predicable in what-kind,

30 In the case of the Trinity, where God's unity had to be reconciled with a triad of divine persons, nominalist followers of Ockham accepted the 'formal distinction' used by realist followers of Scotus, but Scotists had larger ambitions for this subtle metaphysical device.

31 Luke 16:19–31: in the parable of Lazarus, Dives is the rich man who thirsts in Hell. CAMESTRES is a valid mood of the syllogism.

32 A 'proper passion' or 'property' is one that flows from the essence of a thing. A 'real distinction' exists only between items that can be separated, which is not true of the persons of the Trinity, as in n. 30 above.

quod sit aliquid potentiale, in rerum natura possibile, vel aliqua propositio existens vel potens existere in mente. Ideo dico quod quodlibet universale est quaedam intentio animae significans plura pro quibus potest supponere. Ideo una intentio, distincta ab alia, praedicatur de alia non per se sed pro re quam significat. Et ideo talia universalia non sunt entia realia nec sunt extra animam sed sunt quaedam entia in anima, distincta inter se et a rebus extra animam.

8. *Realis* – Veritas et falsitas propositionum est quaedam qualitas inhaerens eis.

9. *Nominalis* – Contra, si ita esset, sequeretur quod aliqua propositio quae aliquando esset vera aliquando susciperet contraria. Etiam sequeretur, si ita esset, quod propositio scripta vere alteraretur per hoc quod musca volaret – quae oratio est absurda. Item, sequeretur quod, quodcumque aliquid moveretur et postea quiesceret, quod una qualitas nova esset in intellectu cuiuslibet formantis talem propositionem hoc movetur, et alia perderetur – quod est absurdum.²¹

10. *Realis* – Omnis quantitas est quaedam res distincta realiter et totaliter a substantia et qualitate. Et quantitas continua est unum accidens, medium inter substantiam et qualitatem, quae ponitur esse subiective in substantia et esse subiectum qualitatum. Et quantitas discreta est res quaedam distincta a substantiis et qualitatibus. Et idem dicitur de loco et tempore.

11. *Nominalis* – Contra, Aristoteles in suis *Praedicamentis*, capitulo de substantia, dicit quod nullum accidens distinctum realiter a substantia est susceptivum contrariorum per sui mutationem. Sed si quantitas continua esset accidens absolutum, distinctum a substantia et qualitate et subiectum immediatum qualitatum, tunc mutaretur recipiendo quantitatem. Et ita per sui mutationem reciperet contraria – quod est contra eum.²²

21 *dependeret*

22 *Et ita] ista*

36 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.43.

37 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.44, opposing the stated view.

38 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.43–4, citing Arist. *Cat.* 4^a10–21.

affirmatively or negatively indicating something external to itself which is brought in through a subject. However, that external need not always be a thing outside the soul, really existing in nature. Instead, it sometimes suffices for it to be something potential, something possible in nature, or else a proposition existing or able to exist in the mind. Hence I say that any universal is some intention of the soul signifying the many items for which it can supposit. Accordingly, one intention, distinct from another, is predicated of the other not as itself but as standing for the thing that it signifies. And this is why such universals are not real beings nor are they outside the soul but are certain beings in the soul, distinct from each other and from things outside the soul.³⁴

8. *Realist* – The truth and falsity of propositions is a certain quality inhering in them.³⁵

9. *Nominalist* – On the contrary, if this were so, it would follow that a proposition that is sometimes true would sometimes accept contraries. It would even follow, if this were so, that a written proposition would truly be altered by a fly's buzzing off – which is an absurd thing to say. Also, whenever something moves and then rests, it would follow that there would be a new quality in the intellect of anyone formulating a proposition like 'this moves,' and another quality would be destroyed – which is absurd.³⁶

10. *Realist* – Every quantity is a certain thing really and totally distinct from substance and quality. And continuous quantity is one accident, midway between substance and quality, which is posited to exist subjectively in substance and to be a subject of qualities. And discrete quantity is a certain thing distinct from substances and qualities. And the same is said of place and time.³⁷

11. *Nominalist* – On the contrary, Aristotle in his *Predicaments*, in the chapter on substance, says that no accident really distinct from substance accepts contraries through a change in itself. But if continuous quantity were a separate accident, distinct from substance and quality and a direct subject of qualities, then it would be changed by receiving quantity. And thus it would receive contraries through a change in itself – which contradicts Aristotle.³⁸

34 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.14.

←35 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.43.

12. Item, si linea sit alia res a superficie et punctus alia a linea, ergo Deus poterit conservare lineam et destruere punctum. Quo facto, quaero. Aut linea est finita aut infinita. Non infinita, ut manifestum est, ergo finita. Et tamen sine puncto. Ergo frustra ponitur punctus terminans lineam, ideo dicitur quod quantitas continua permanens nihil aliud est nisi res una habens partem distantem situationaliter a parte, ita quod quantitas continua permanens et illa oratio equivalens in significando sunt termini convertibiles, nisi aliqua determinatio sit inclusa equivalenter quae impediat convertibilitatem et praedicationem unius de alio.²³

13. Et hoc dico loquendo naturaliter et insequendo viam Perhipatheticam, et ideo isti reales male dicunt quod quantitas sit alia res a substantia – loquendo naturaliter. Et etiam quando dicunt quod punctus est aliqua res totaliter distincta a linea, copulans partes corporis adinvicem; et quod linea sit alia res a superficie, continuans et copulans partes superficiei; et superficies est alia res a corpore, continuans et copulans partes corporis adinvicem; et quod oratio sit alia res a voce prolata et quantitate eius; et quod numerus sit alia res a rebus numeratis et accidens existens in eis; et quod locus et tempus sint distinctae res inter se ab omnibus supradictis – omnia ista falsa sunt et quasi impossibilia.²⁴ Et causae istarum positionum sunt fantasiae hominum.

14. *Realis* – Relatio est res distincta realiter et totaliter a re absoluta et a rebus absolutis.

15. *Nominalis* – Contra tuam rationem arguo sic. Si esset res aliqua talis, tunc, quandocumque musca moveretur localiter hic inferius, quodlibet celeste mutaretur et reciperet aliquam rem de novo in se quia aliter distaret nunc musca quam prius, et per consequens vere perderet et unam rem et aliam de novo reciperet. Item, Philosophus in quinto *Phisicorum* dicit quod ad relationem non est motus neque mutatio. Sed ad omnem rem extra animam est mutatio, ergo et cetera.

²³ *distinctam situationaliter*

²⁴ *superficies est illa res*

12. Again, if a line is a thing apart from a surface and a point from a line, then God will be able to preserve the line and destroy the point. Once this is done, I have a problem. The line is either finite or infinite. It is not infinite, obviously, so it is finite. And yet it has no point. So it is useless to treat the line as terminated by a point, which is why we say that permanent continuous quantity is nothing other than 'a single thing having one part distant in place from another part,' such that 'permanent continuous quantity' and that phrase with equivalent meaning are convertible terms, unless some determination is included equivalently that impedes convertibility and predicating the one of the other.³⁹

13. I say this speaking naturally and following the Peripatetic way, which is why those realists are wrong to say – speaking naturally – that quantity is a thing apart from substance. Also, when they say that a point is a thing totally distinct from the line, joining the body's parts to each other; that a line is a thing apart from the surface, continuing and joining the parts of the surface; that a surface is a thing apart from the body, continuing and joining the body's parts to each other; that a statement is a thing apart from the spoken sound and its quantity; that a number is a thing apart from the things numbered and an accident existing in them; and that place and time are each things distinct from one other and from all the above – when they say all these things, they are false and basically impossible. And the reasons for these claims of theirs are human fantasies.⁴⁰

14. *Realist* – A relation is a thing really and totally distinct from a separate thing and from separate things.⁴¹

15. *Nominalist* – Against your account I argue in this way. If there were any such thing, then, whenever a fly moves in place here below, any heavenly body you pick would change and would take some thing into itself anew because now the fly is at a different distance than before, and as a consequence it would truly both lose one thing and also take in another anew. Also, the Philosopher in the fifth book of the *Physics* says that for a relation there is neither motion nor change. But for every thing outside the soul there is change, therefore and so on.⁴²

39 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.44.

40 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.44; *Exp. phys.* 3 ad 71.

41 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.49, opposing the stated view.

42 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.49–50, where the moving animal is a donkey; Arist. *Phys.* 225^b11–13.

16. Item, si hoc esset verum, sequeretur quod potentia materiae primae qua potest recipere formam esset alia materia. Consequens est falsum quia tunc essent in materia res infinitae ex quo potest successive infinitas formas recipere. Ergo, propter rationes tales dico quod relatio non est alia res extra animam, distincta realiter et totaliter a re absoluta vel a rebus absolutis. Et de tali opinione reputo esse Aristotelem et suum Commentatorem.

17. *Realis* – Actio est quaedam res distincta ab agente, producto et passo, et a ceteris rebus absolutis. Et est quidam respectus qui ab aliquibus ponitur esse in agente subiective et ab aliquibus ponitur esse in passo. Et aliquando est respectus realis, aliquando est respectus rationis, sicut actio Dei non est nisi respectus rationis.

18. *Nominalis* – Si tua opinio esset vera, tunc quaero an illa res quae est actio aut est res creata vel increata. Si non est creata, ergo est Deus. Si creata, quaero a quo. Non nisi ab agente, ut scilicet producat illam rem. Hoc dato, quaero de productione illius rei. Sicut prius, erit processus in infinitum, vel stabitur quod una res producitur sine omni re media, quod est falsum.²⁵ Et sic possumus dicere de passione. Ideo dicitur propter multas rationes quod actio non est alia res distincta ab agente. Et passio et illa substantia quae patitur unum et idem sunt.²⁶

19. *Realis* – Quando vel quandeitas est quaedam res respectiva, derelicta in re temporali ex adiacentia temporis propter quod dicitur quod res fuit vel erit vel est, et est res distincta a substantia et qualitate.²⁷

20. *Nominalis* – Contra, secundum omnes logicos quilibet respectus habet ponere aliquem terminum, et – sicut de se patet – non potest poni aliquis terminus illius respectus quando nisi tempus. Sed tempus multorum quod vocatur quando est praeteritum, et per consequens non terminat talem respectum reale. Ideo dico quod quando est ordinatio adverbiorum vel aliorum eius aequivalentium, quibus convenienter respondetur ad interrogationem factam

25 *omni remedio*

26 *et passo et*

27 *propter quod] praeterquam*

46 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.59, opposing the stated view.

47 Here 'term' is used in the sense of a 'terminus' or boundary in English.

16. Also, if this were true, it would follow that the potency of prime matter by which it can receive form would be additional matter. The conclusion is false because then there would be infinite things in matter whereby it could receive forms in infinite succession. Hence, for those reasons I say that a relation is not another thing outside the soul, really and totally distinct from a separate thing and from separate things. And I reckon Aristotle to be of this opinion and also his Commentator.⁴³

17. *Realist* – Action is a certain thing distinct from the agent, the product and the affected, and also from other separate things. And it is a sort of ‘attitude’ that some claim to be in the agent subjectively and some claim to be in the affected. And sometimes the attitude is real, sometimes it is an attitude of reason, just as God’s acting is nothing but an attitude of reason.⁴⁴

18. *Nominalist* – If your view were correct, then I ask whether the thing that is action is a created or uncreated thing. If it is not created, then it is God. If it is created, I ask by whom. Only by an agent, of course, in order for it to produce the thing. Given this, I ask about the production of the thing. Just as before, there will be an infinite regress, or it will remain that a thing is produced without any intermediary, which is false. And we can say the same about passion. Hence, for many reasons, we say that action is not another thing distinct from the agent. And passion and the substance that is affected are one and the same.⁴⁵

19. *Realist* – *When* or *whenness* is a certain element of attitude, left over in a temporal thing from the nearness of the time because of which we say that a thing was or will be or is, and it is a thing distinct from substance and from quality.⁴⁶

20. *Nominalist* – On the contrary, according to all logicians any attitude has to establish some term, and – as is clear in itself – for this *when* attitude no term can be established except time.⁴⁷ But for many things the time that is called ‘when’ is past, and as a consequence it does not terminate such a real attitude. This is why I say that *when* is an ordering of adverbs or of other equivalents –

43 Ockham, *Summ. Log.* 1.49–50; the Commentator is Averroes, *Comm. in 12 Metaph.*, 19.

44 Ockham, *Summ. Log.* 1.57, opposing the stated view: *respectus* is more or less synonymous with *relatio* or *habitus* in the sense of ‘relation’; we use ‘attitude’ for *respectus* to preserve the distinction in terminology.

←45 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.57–8.

per hoc interrogativum quando, ut hodie, heri, cras. Unde secundum viam Peripatheticorum hoc praedicamentum non importat aliquam rem distinctam a substantia et qualitate, sed importat illas ut easdem res, quamvis non nominaliter sed adverbialiter tantum.²⁸

21. *Realis* – Ubi sive ubitas est quidam respectus fundatus in locato, procedens ex circumscriptione loci. Et locatum fundat talem respectum, et locus terminat eum.²⁹

22. *Nominalis* – Contra, si Deus faceret unum corpus sine omni loco, adhuc posset illud corpus moveri, et tamen tunc nihil quiesceret, nec esset aliquod ubi acquisitum praeterea si sit. Tunc non ullum totum caelum, sed et quaelibet pars haberet tale ubi, et per consequens essent tot alia ubi in caelo quot sunt partes in caelo. Vel erit unus respectus totalis extensus ad extensionem caeli, quod non est imaginandum. Ideo dico quod ubi non est alia res distincta a loco et ceteris rebus absolutis.

23. Sed semper Philosophus hoc praedicamentum per adverbium interrogativum loci nominat, in quo praedicamento ponuntur illa quae convenienter respondentur ad quaestionem factam per hoc adverbium ubi, ut si quaeratur ubi est Plato, convenienter respondetur quod est in teatro, in foro. Ideo illas praepositiones cum suis casualibus Philosophus ponit in praedicamento ubi.³⁰

24. *Realis* – Positio est quidam respectus toti inhaerens vel partibus ita quod ex hoc quod surgit qui sedet habet unam rem in se quam prius non habuit, et unam aliam quam prius habuit perdidit.³¹

25. *Nominalis* – Contra, etiamsi accipio aliquem vestitum, possibile est quod Deus destruat talem respectum qui vocatur habitus, non destruendo vestem nec corpus nec movendo ipsum localiter.³² Hoc posito, quaero utrum esset vestitus aut non. Si sic, habetur propositum. Si non, et nihil absolutum est

28 *et easdem*

29 *quidem*

30 *propositiones*

31 *non habuit quia unam aliam quam prius non habuit et*

32 *et accipio*

like 'today,' 'yesterday,' 'tomorrow' – that respond appropriately to a question asked by the interrogative 'when.' Hence, following the path of the Peripatetics, this predicament does not bring in any thing distinct from substance and quality, but those it brings in as the same things, though only adverbially, not nominally.⁴⁸

21. *Realist* – *Where* or *whereness* is a certain attitude fixed in what is placed, arising from the boundedness of the place. The thing placed fixes that attitude, and the place terminates it.⁴⁹

22. *Nominalist* – On the contrary, if God were to make a single body without any place, that body could still be moved, and yet nothing would then rest, nor, if it did, would any *where* be gained in addition. Then there would be no 'whole heavens,' but any part at all would also have such a *where*, and as a consequence there would be as many other *wheres* in the heavens as there are parts in it. Or else there will be one total attitude extended to the extent of the heavens, which one cannot imagine. So I say that *where* is not another thing distinct from place and other separate things.⁵⁰

23. But the Philosopher always names this predicament with an interrogative adverb of place, putting in that predicament those items that respond appropriately to a question asked using the adverb 'where,' as, when one asks 'where is Plato,' an appropriate response is that he is 'in the theater' or 'in the agora.' This is why the Philosopher puts those prepositions with their inflected words in the *where* category.⁵¹

24. *Realist* – Position is a certain attitude inhering in the whole or in the parts so that one who sits after standing has in himself a thing that he did not have before, and he has lost one thing that he did have before.⁵²

25. *Nominalist* – On the contrary, even if I accept that someone has clothes on, it is possible for God to destroy the attitude called 'having' without destroying the clothing or the body or moving its place. With this established, I ask

48 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.59.

49 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.60, opposing the stated view.

50 Ockham, *Quodlib.* 7.11.

51 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.60, with different examples and alluding to Arist. *Cat.* 11^b13–14.

52 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.61, opposing the stated view.

corruptum, ergo est aliquando motum localiter quia impossibile est quod aliquis sit primo vestitus et postea devestitus nisi propter corruptionem alicuius absoluti aut propter motum localem alicuius absoluti.³³ Ideo dico quod positio non significat rem distinctam a rebus absolutis sed significat quod partes rei sic ordinantur et situantur et appropinquantur.³⁴ In hoc praedicamento sunt sedere et stare, inclinari, iacere.

26. *Realis* – Habitus est quidam respectus in ipso corpore circa quod illud corpus est vel in ipso corpore contento.³⁵

27. *Nominalis* – Habitus non significat rem distinctam a rebus absolutis, sed significat quod una res sit circa aliam, mobilis ad motum ipsius nisi aliquod impedimentum, quae non est rei nec simul cum re sed loco et situ distincta ab ea.³⁶ In quo praedicamento ponuntur talia armatum esse vel calciatum esse, et sic de aliis. Et possumus arguere contra realem eodem modo ut arguebatur in aliis praedicamentis.

5

*Finiuntur dicta realium
cum rationibus nominalium
per Simphorianum Champerium.³⁷
Sequuntur regulae generales suppositionum
iuvenibus multum utiles.*

1. Circa suppositiones notandum est quod solum cathegoreuma quod est extremum propositionis significative acceptum supponit personaliter.³⁸

33 aut] nunc

34 dico quod ubi

35 quidem

36 citra aliam; in se aliquod

37 Champerii

38 cathregreuma

significations of terms are the core of the older 'terminist' logic that Ockham successfully challenged, unlike the modists, who failed in their attempt to replace the terminist 'logic of the moderns' with something entirely different. For the background, see Marilyn McCord Adams, *William Ockham* (Notre Dame IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1987), 1.327–67; Calvin Normore, "Material Supposition and the Mental Language of Ockham's *Summa logicae*," *Topoi* 16 (1997): 27–33.

whether the person would be clothed or not. If so, the proposition holds. If not, and if no separate item is destroyed, then at some time it has moved in place since it is impossible for anyone first to be clothed and later unclothed unless something separate is destroyed or something separate has moved in place. For this reason, I say that position does not signify a thing distinct from separate things but signifies instead how the parts of a thing are ordered, situated and brought near. In this predicament are sitting as well as standing, also bending and lying.⁵³

26. *Realist* – Having is a certain attitude in the body that surrounds a body or in the body that is contained.⁵⁴

27. *Nominalist* – Having does not signify a thing distinct from separate things, signifying instead that one thing surrounds another thing, moving with its motion unless something blocks it, and is not part of the thing nor together with it but distinct from it in place and situation. In this predicament we put such things as being armored or shod, and so on. And we can argue against the realist in the same way as the argument went for the other predicaments.⁵⁵

5

*The End of the Statements of the Realists
with Nominalist Arguments
by Symphorien Champier.
General Rules of Suppositions Follow,
Very Useful for Young Students.*

1. Concerning suppositions it should be noted that only a categorematic term which is an extreme – taken as signifying – of a proposition supposits personally.⁵⁶

53 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.61: note that *positio* in Champier's conclusion is our emendation, based on Ockham, of *ubi*, which is a different category already discussed, and that Ockham does not use the clothing example.

54 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.62, opposing the stated view.

55 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.62.

56 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.69: Champier now follows Ockham through the last fourteen chapters of the *Summa* that introduce supposition as a property of terms, as distinct from the issues of signification discussed in the previous part of the *Summa*. The properties and

2. Suppositio materialis est quando terminus non supponit significative sed supponit pro voce vel pro scriptura, ut dicendo homo est terminus scriptus.
3. Suppositio simplex est quando terminus supponit pro intentione animae sed non tenetur significative, ut homo est species: ly homo supponit simpliciter.
4. Notandum est quod etiam ista diffinitio suppositionis personalis bona quae est quando terminus capitur pro sua significato et capitur significative, ut homo est animal.

*Sequuntur regulae particulares.*³⁹

5. Prima regula: semper terminus discretus supponit discrete et sub ipso non contingit descendere, ut Petrus est homo, iste homo currit.
6. Secunda regula: omnis terminus communis positus in aliqua propositione sine signo supponit determinate, et sub ipso contingit descendere disiunctive, ut dicendo homo currit.
7. Tertia regula: omnis terminus communis positus in aliqua propositione post signum particulare non impeditum supponit determinate, et sub ipso contingit descendere disiunctive, ut dicendo aliquis homo currit.
8. Quarta regula: omnis terminus immediate sequens signum universale affirmativum supponit confuse et distributive, et terminus mediate sequens confuse tantum, ut omnis homo est animal: ly homo supponit distributive, et debemus descendere copulative; et ly animal supponit confuse tantum et debemus descendere disinunctive.
9. Quinta regula: Omnis terminus communis sequens immediate signum exclusivum supponit confuse tantum, et terminus mediate sequens confuse et distributive, ut tantum homo est rationalis: ly homo supponit confuse tantum, et ly rationale confuse et distributive.

39 *Sequitur*

62 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.71.

63 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.70, 74.

64 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.73.

2. Material supposition is when a term does not supposit as signifying but supposits for a spoken or written word, as in saying that 'man' is a written term.⁵⁷
3. Simple supposition is when a term supposits for an intention of the soul but is not taken as signifying – as the 'man' in 'man is a species' supposits simply.⁵⁸
4. Note that it is also a good definition of personal supposition when a term stands for what is signified by it and is understood as signifying, as in 'man is an animal.'⁵⁹

The following are particular rules.

5. First rule: a discrete term always supposits discretely, and there is no descending under it, like 'Peter is a man' and 'that man runs.'⁶⁰
6. Second rule: every common term put in a proposition without a sign supposits determinately, and under it there is descending disjunctively, as in saying 'man runs.'⁶¹
7. Third rule: every common term put in a proposition after a particular, non-impeding sign, supposits determinately, and under it there is descending disjunctively, as in saying 'some man runs.'⁶²
8. Fourth rule: Every term immediately following a universal affirmative sign supposits confusedly and distributively, and a term following mediately supposits merely confusedly, like 'every man is an animal': the 'man' supposits distributively, and we must descend by coupling; the 'animal' supposits merely confusedly, and we must descend disjunctively.⁶³
9. Fifth rule: Every common term immediately following an exclusive sign supposits merely confusedly, and a term following mediately supposits confusedly and distributively, like 'only man is rational': the 'man' supposits merely confusedly, and the 'rational' supposits confusedly and distributively.⁶⁴

57 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.64.

58 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.64.

59 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.64.

60 Ockham, *Summ.* 1.19, 70.

61 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.70.

10. Sexta regula: omnis terminus tam mediate quam immediate sequens negationem, sive adverbialem sive nominalem, supponit confuse et distributive, ut nullus homo est risibilis: tam subiectum quam praedicatum supponit confuse et distributive.

11. Septima regula: Totienscumque duo signa distributiva se includunt, unum tollit vim alterius, et sic faciunt terminum supponere determinate per regulam, quodcumque mobilitat immobilitatum immobilitat mobilitatum.⁴⁰

12. Octava regula: Adverbia similitudinis ut ita, sicut et sic de aliis faciunt terminos sequentes se supponentes distribuibiles, et – non aliunde impeditos – supponere confuse et distributive, ut dicendo Plato est ita fortis sicut leo, ly leo supponit confuse et distributive.⁴¹

13. Nona regula: Differt et differens diversum et consimiles, includentes in se negationem, faciunt ablativos sequentes se rectos ab eis mediante illa praepositione a vel ab distribuibiles et – non aliunde impeditos – supponere confuse et distributive.⁴²

14. Decima regula: Omnis terminus communis, supra quem cadit immediate dictio exceptiva, distribuibilis et supponens, supponit confuse et distributive, vel confuse tantum accedendo ad confusam et distributivam, dummodo non impediatur per aliquod signum exclusivum, ut omne animal praeter hominem est irrationale.⁴³

15. Undecima regula: Omnis terminus communis supponens communiter, sequens dictionem importantem actum animae interiorem, rectus a tali dictione in quam transit actus importatus per talem dictionem supponit confuse tantum – et hoc si nulla includatur negatio. Exemplum ut cognosco hominem, ly hominem supponit confuse tantum.

40 *quicumquod mobilitat*

41 *distribuibiles*

42 *distribuibiles*

43 *distribuibilis*

10. Sixth rule: Every term immediately or mediately following a negation, whether adverbial or nominal, supposits confusedly and distributively, like 'no man is risible': the subject as well as the predicate supposits confusedly and distributively.

11. Seventh rule: Whenever two distributive signs include themselves, one takes away the effect of the other, and so they make the term supposit determinately according to the rule, *whatever mobilizes the immobilized immobilizes the mobilized*.⁶⁵

12. Eighth rule: Such adverbs of likeness as 'as,' 'just as' and so on make the suppositing terms following them distributable, and – if nothing else impedes – make them supposit confusedly and distributively, as when we say 'Plato is as strong as a lion,' the 'lion' supposits confusedly and distributively.

13. Ninth rule: 'Differs' and 'differing,' 'divergent' and so on, when they include a negation, make distributable – with either form of the preposition 'from' mediating – the ablatives that follow and are governed by those expressions, and, if nothing else impedes, they make them supposit confusedly and distributively.⁶⁶

14. Tenth rule: Every common term, when directly modified by an expression that is exceptive, distributable and suppositing, supposits confusedly and distributively, or else merely confusedly while coming close to confused and distributive supposition, provided that it is not impeded by any exclusive sign, like 'every animal except man is non-rational.'⁶⁷

15. Eleventh rule: Every common term with common supposition, when it follows an expression conveying an internal act of the soul, supposits merely confusedly when governed by the expression that is the object of the act conveyed by that expression – and this is so if no negation is included. In 'I know a man,' for example, the 'man' supposits merely confusedly.⁶⁸

65 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.74.

66 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.74.

67 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.74.

68 Buridan in Carl von Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande* IV (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1870), 29.

16. Duodecima regula: Omnis terminus supponens communiter, sequens adverbium numerale supponens, supponit confuse tantum, ut bis bibi vinum: ly vinum supponit confuse tantum.

17. Tertiadecima regula: Omnis terminus supponens communiter, sequens copulatum de praedicamento ubi et etiam quando supponens, supponit confuse tantum, nisi aliud signum impediat. Et hoc si in tali copulato illa coniunctio et capiatur divisive et non expletive.

18. Quartadecima regula: Omne nomen sequens comparativum vel superlativum gradum rectum ab eo supponens – et non impeditum aliunde – supponit confuse et distributive, ut leo est fortior homine: ly homine supponit confuse et distributive.

19. Quintadecima regula: In omni suppositione distributiva debemus descendere copulative, et in confusa tantum disiunctim, et in determinata disiunctive, et in collectiva copulativim, ut in ista omnes apostoli Dei sunt duodecim: ly apostoli Dei supponit discrete collective, et debemus descendere copulativim.

20. Et si aliquis diceret: contra, sub suppositione discreta non sit descensus, sed suppositio collectiva est discreta, ergo non sit descensus sub ea; ad hoc dicitur quod illa regula intelligitur quod non sit descensus sub suppositione discreta non collectiva, sed dicendo omnes apostoli Dei sunt duodecim, ipsa est collectiva.

21. Et si ultra argueretur: contra, repugnat suppositioni discrete ut supponat pro pluribus, sed suppositio collectiva supponit pro pluribus, ergo non est discreta; ad hoc dicitur quod repugnat quod supponat pro pluribus divisim – sed non coniunctim, modo dicendo omnes apostoli Dei supponit coniunctim.⁴⁴ Vel dicitur quod non repugnat ut supponat pro pluribus si sit collectiva; modo regula intelligitur de discreta non collectiva.

44 *repugnant*

descent, one to a disjunction of propositions, the other to a single proposition containing a disjunctive term, but the distinction seems not to hold for *Isag.* 5.7–8.

72 *Isag.* 5.5.

16. Twelfth rule: Every term with common supposition, when it follows a numerical adverb with supposition, supposits merely confusedly, like 'twice I drank wine': the 'wine' supposits merely confusedly.⁶⁹

17. Thirteenth rule: Every term with common supposition, when it follows a coupled word suppositing from the category of *where* and also *when*, supposits merely confusedly unless another sign impedes – and this is so if the conjunction in that coupled expression is understood to divide and not to complete.⁷⁰

18. Fourteenth rule: Every noun that supposits and follows a comparative or superlative degree governed by it – and if nothing else impedes – supposits confusedly and distributively, like 'a lion is stronger than a man': the 'man' supposits confusedly and distributively.

19. Fifteenth rule: In every supposition that distributes we must descend by coupling, in the merely confused by disjoining, in the determinate disjunctively, and the collective by coupling, like that 'all the apostles of God are twelve': the 'apostles of God' supposits discretely and collectively, and we must descend by coupling.⁷¹

20. And if someone should say this: on the contrary, under discrete supposition there is no descending, but collective supposition is discrete, so there would be no descending under it; the reply to this is that the rule means that there would be no descending under a supposition that is discrete and not collective, but when we say 'all the apostles of God are twelve,' it is collective.⁷²

21. And if it were argued further in this way: on the contrary, suppositing for many is inconsistent with discrete supposition, but collective supposition supposits for many, so it is not discrete; the reply to this is that the inconsistency is suppositing for many as divided – but not as conjoined, yet when we say 'all the apostles of God,' it supposits as conjoined. Or else the reply is that suppositing for many is not inconsistent if it is collective, yet the rule is meant to apply to discrete, not collective supposition.

69 Ibid.

70 Ibid.

71 If all the apostles are twelve, then Peter is twelve, John is twelve and so on: this is a famous
← sophism. The similar words *disiunctim* and *disiunctive* may indicate two different types of

22. Nota quod reales differunt a nominalibus in suppositionibus in multis locis. Primo, reales dicunt quod terminus extra propositionem positus supponit; nominales dicunt contrarium. Secundo, differunt in hoc, quia dicunt quod termini ficticii supponunt, ut sunt isti chimera, hircocervus; nominales dicunt quod non. Tertio, differunt quia reales dicunt quod suppositio simplex est quando terminus capitur pro natura communi; nominales dicunt quod non cum nulla sit natura communis. Et ultra dicunt quod suppositio simplex est acceptio termini pro conceptu mentis, ut subiectum huius propositionis homo est species. Quarto, differunt quia reales dicunt quod est aliqua suppositio immobilis in qua non potest fieri descensus – ut sub subiecto huius propositionis: omnis homo praeter Petrum currit. Nominales dicunt quod nulla est immobilis, si immobilis capiatur eo modo ut reales capiunt.

23. Omnia illa dicta realium sunt falsa et impossibilia. Ideo, pro conclusione, dico quod dicta nominalium sunt verissima et invincibilia. Et sic de ysagogiis Simphoriani Champerii, gratia Paracliti, dicta sufficiant.

6

*Sequitur capitulum de primis et secundis intentionibus,
valde necessarium iuvenibus.*

1. Intentio animae vocatur quoddam signum in anima natum significare aliquid pro quo potest supponere vel quod potest esse pars propositionis mentalis, et est duplex.⁴⁵

2. Unum quod est signum alicuius rei quae non est tale signum sive significet tale signum utrum homo sive non.⁴⁶ Et illud vocatur prima intentio qualis est intentio animae praedicabilis de omnibus animalibus et similiter intentio praedicabilis de omnibus albedinibus. Et sic prima intentio potest sic diffiniri capiendo stricte: prima intentio est nomen mentale natum pro suo significato supponere. Large capiendo est omne signum intentionale existens in anima quod non significat intentiones vel signa praecise.

45 *quoddam eius in*

46 *cum homo*

22. Note that realists disagree with nominalists about suppositions on many points. First, realists say that a term supposits when located outside a proposition, while nominalists say the opposite. Second, they disagree about whether fictional terms supposit – those like ‘chimera’ and ‘goatstag’: nominalists say that they do not. Third, they disagree because realists say that simple supposition occurs when a term is understood as a common nature, while nominalists say no since there is no common nature. Moreover, they say that simple supposition is taking a term for a concept of the mind, like the subject of the proposition ‘man is a species.’ Fourth, they disagree because realists say that there is some immobile supposition in which descent cannot happen – under the subject of this proposition, for example: ‘every man except Peter runs.’ Nominalists say that none is immobile, if ‘immobile’ is understood as the realists understand it.

23. All those claims of the realists are false and impossible. Hence, I say in conclusion that the claims of the nominalists are entirely true and invincible. So then, by the grace of the Paraclete, let these statements suffice for Symphorien Champier’s introductions.

6

*A chapter on first and second intentions follows,
much needed by young students.*

1. Some sign in the soul suited to signify anything for which it can supposit or that can be part of a mental proposition is called an *intention* of the soul, and there are two types.

2. One is a sign of some thing that is not such a sign whether or not it signifies such a sign with it. And the sign called a *first intention* is like the intention of the soul that is predicable of all animals and, in the same way, the intention predicable of all whitenesses. Accordingly, a first intention – strictly understood – can be defined in this way: a first intention is a mental name produced to supposit for what it signifies. Broadly understood, it is any intentional sign existing in the soul that does not signify intentions or signs exactly.⁷³

73 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.12.

3. Sed secunda intentio est illa quae est signum talium intentionum primarum. Cuiusmodi sunt tales intentiones praedicamentum universale, genus, species et huiusmodi. Sicut enim de omnibus asinis praedicatur una intentio communis asinis, sic dicendo ille asinus est asinus, et ille asinus est et sic de aliis, ita de illis intentionibus quae significant et supponunt pro rebus quae sunt signa praedicatur una intentio communis eis, sic dicendo hoc genus est genus et illud genus est genus, similiter sic dicendo corpus est genus, animal est genus, color est genus et sic de aliis praedicatur una intentio. De intentionibus: ad modum quo in talibus homo est nomen praedicatur uno nomine de diversis nominibus, et sic nomina secundae impositionis significant ad placitum nomina primae impositionis, et sic secunda intentio naturaliter significat primam, et sicut nomen primae impositionis significat aliam quam nomen, ita prima intentio significat alias res quam intentionem.⁴⁷

4. Nota quod nomina primae dicuntur nomina rerum et secundae nomina nominum.

Finis.

7

1. Quanquam praesens opusculum sufficienter divisum sit in tres partes praecise, ut patet in epistola prohemiali, ex quo tamen aliqua in praesenti opusculo considerantur quae non videntur – saltem explicite – contineri sub illa divisione, ideo ad maiorem elucidationem ingeniosissimis nominalibus dandam potest praesens opusculum perutile dividi in quinque partes.

2. In quarum prima ad longum declaratur octo esse principia grammatices.

3. In secunda ostenditur quid tam ingeniosi nominales quam reales circa eadem principia sentiant, destruendo quodammodo naturas communes.

4. In tertia errores enormes realium humiliter corriguntur et rationibus acutissimis ad veritatem reducuntur.

47 *significant alia; alia quam nomen; quam intentionem*

3. But a second intention is one that is a sign of those first intentions. Of this type are such intentions as the universal predicament, the genus, the species and others of this sort. For just as we predicate of all donkeys a single intention common to donkeys when we say 'that donkey is a donkey' and 'this donkey is' and so on for others, in the same way, of those intentions that signify and supposit for things that are signs, we predicate a single intention common to them, as we predicate an intention of intentions by saying 'this genus is a genus' and 'that genus is a genus' and, in the same way, by saying 'body is a genus,' 'animal is a genus,' 'color is a genus' and so on for others, in the way that we use one name in such statements as '“man” is a name' to predicate of various names, and as we designate names of second imposition to signify names of first imposition, and as a second intention naturally signifies a first, and as a name of first imposition signifies something other than a name, so a first intention signifies things other than an intention.⁷⁴

4. Note that names of first intention are called *names of things* and those of second intention *names of names*.⁷⁵

The End.

7

1. Although it is enough to divide the present work into exactly three parts, as the prefatory letter makes clear, yet because the present work considers some topics that seem not to be included in that division – at least explicitly – the present work can be quite usefully divided into five parts in order to shed more light on those very clever nominalists.

2. The first of them explains at length that there are eight principles of grammar.

3. The second shows what the clever nominalists and also the realists think about the same principles, more or less destroying common natures.

4. The third humbly corrects outrageous errors of the realists and leads them back to the truth by very thoughtful arguments.

74 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.12.

75 Ockham, *Summ. log.* 1.11.

5. In quarta ponuntur tam regulae universales quam particulares suppositionum, annectens etiam differentiam suppositionis inter dominos nominales et reales.

6. In quinta et ultima parte agitur de primis et secundis intentionibus, ut patebit intuenti.

5. The fourth states both universal and particular rules of supposition, also adding the disagreement between nominalist and realist masters on supposition.
6. The fifth and final part deals with first and second intentions, as you can plainly see.

Index of Manuscripts

Augsburg Staats- und Stadtbibliothek
2° cod. 10 486n151

Bernkastel-Kues Bibliothek des St. Nikolaus-
Hospitals 52 (C 14) 470n94

Brussels Bibliothèque Royale,
9893–9894 27n18

Budapest Hungarian National Library
Széchényi, Lat. 443 142n28

Douai Bibliothèque Municipale 219 469n93
Dublin Trinity College Library 514 469n93

Eichstätt Universitätsbibliothek Eichstätt-
Ingolstadt st. 633 486n151

Florence Biblioteca Laurenziana

36.35 184

80.9. 185

Ashburnham 501 236n59, 236n60

Ashburnham 1866 225n28, 237n62

Ashburnham 2166 225n28

Ashburnham 2167 225n28

Ashburnham 2168 237n64

Ashburnham 2169 225n28

Ashburnham 2476 238n66

Ashburnham 2870 238n65

Conv. Soppr. 103 186n37

Plut. 34.50 48n44

Plut. 36 dext. 6 486n98, 488

Plut. 85.8 186n37

Plut. 90, sup. 8 49–52

Florence Biblioteca Moreniana

33 128n97

200¹ 111n26

Florence Biblioteca Riccardiana

24 180n7

2621 36n3, 111n23, 111n25

Gr. 70 183

Genoa Biblioteca Universitaria C.vii.46
479n125

Leiden Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Voss.
lat. Q 69 469n93

London British Library

Harl. 6149 31n30

Stowe 668 31n30

Royal lat. 15.A.xxii 469n93

Royal lat. 15.B.xi 469n93

London College of Arms 63 431n30

Madrid Biblioteca Nacional 59 469n93

Metz Bibliothèque-Médiathèque de la Ville
1212 469n93, 470n94

Milan Biblioteca Ambrosiana

A 83 145

D 105 sup 478n121, 479n124

I 115 sup 20n38

Modena Biblioteca Estense á. Q. 9. 12 138n10

Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM
14619 470n94

Oxford Bodleian Library

Ashmole 764 31n30

Douce 271 31n30

Oxford Queens College 161 31n30

Paris Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal Grec. 8407
470n94

Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BnF)

FR 15188 231n44

FR 15189 236n59

Gr. 1256 179

Gr. 2524 7

Lat. 1678 479n124

Lat. 6729A 31n30

Lat. 8229 9n31

Lat. 11432 236n60

NAF 1341 228n39

nouv. acq. lat. 1302 27n18, 32–5

Siena Biblioteca Comunale F.11.13 469n93

Vatican Archivio Segreto Vaticano (ASV)

Arm. 39, vol. 14 154n.68

Vatican Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV)

Chigi. R.viii 58 180n7

Ottob. lat. 1903 478n18

Palat. Gr. 63 184n27

- Palat. Lat. 604 492, 495-6
 Vat. Gr. 370 514n46
 Vat. Gr. 2197 185
 Vat. Lat. 227 478nn8, 484n147
 Vat. Lat. 1690 9n31
 Vat. Lat. 3186 137n10
 Venice Biblioteca Marciana
 Gr. 200 7
 Gr. 384 7
 Lat. VI 210 8
- Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek
 (ÖNB) Gr. 64 7
 Volterra Biblioteca Comunale Guarnacciana
 6201 181
- Wrocław Biblioteka Uniwersytecka R
 436 470n94

Index of Modern Authors

- Ábel, Jenő 162n89
Achard, Guy 326n271, 328n278
Adam, James 266n73
Adams, Marilyn McCord 591n56
Adkin, Neil 459n59, 460n61
Adler, Ada 513n41
Adler, Maximilian 418n587
Adorno, Francesco 132n124
Ady, Cecilia M. 24n3
Aherne, Consuelo Maria 467n87, 468n91
Akkerman, Fokke 160n81, 202n19, 213n52, 215n55
Alberigo, Giuseppe xivn5, 14n14
Alesse, Francesca 286n149, 291n162
Alexander, Paul 360n388
Alexandre, Charles 413n569, 414n570, 414n572, 415n575, 416n576, 416n581, 418n587, 418n588, 418n589, 418n590, 419n594, 419n596, 420n601, 422n613, 423n616, 423n617, 423n618, 424n624, 425n627, 426n630, 444
Algra, Keimpe 292n165
Allen, Don Cameron 220n16
Allen, James 387n477
Allen, Michael J.B. xxxviii, 179–195
Allen, Percy Stafford 53n2
Allen, Thomas W. 258n43
Alleyne, Sarah Frances 248n14
Allut, Paul 547, 549
Amat, Jacqueline 461n69
Anderson, William B. 51
Anderson, William H.U. 393n500
Andolfo, Matteo 275n105, 372n434
André, Jacques 467n86
André, Jean-Marie 421n606
Andresen, Carl 343n316
Andrewes, Antony 261n52
Angeleri, Carlo 36n1, 37n5
Angelou, Athanasios D. 366n417
Angelov, Dimiter 358n376
Annas, Julia 304n205, 351n346
Anspach, August Eduard 468n91
Anton, John P. 246n10
Armstrong, Arthur Hilary 293n168
Armstrong, Pamela 85n71
Aschoff, Diethard 281n130
Assirelli, Marco 108n9
Athanassiadi, Polymnia 450n15
Audet, Thomas-André 306n212
Avellini, Luisa 4n7
Ayede, Murat 278n114
Ayes, Lewis 448n7
Baarda, Tjitze 284n141
Babbitt, F. Cole 294n170
Babington, Churchill 388n482
Babut, Daniel 255n35, 273n96, 295n177, 297n185
Bacchelli, Franco 124n81, 186n38
Badagos, René 547n4
Balivet, Michel 404n539
Balletto, Laura 71n18, 78n49
Bandini, Angelo Maria 116n55, 118n60, 119n63, 122n75, 122n76, 122n77, 123n80, 123n81, 124n84, 124n85, 124n86, 127n92
Bär, Silvio 249n17
Baratin, Marc 364n408
Barbanti, Maria 186n38
Barberi, Francesco 10n35
Barberi, Giorgio 132n124
Bardet, Sergé 219n12
Bardy, Gustave 307n215, 308n216
Barnes, Jonathan 105n41, 259n47, 263n64, 292n165, 304n205, 351n346, 393n500
Barnes, Timothy 448n6, 449n11, 451n20, 451n21, 451n22, 452n25, 454n34, 456, 457n29, 457n50, 457n51, 457n52, 458n55, 460n64, 463n75, 464n76
Barney, Stephen A. 467n86
Baron, Hans 100, 135, 159n79, 475n109
Barret-Kriegel, Blandine 220n17
Bartók, István 135n4
Bass, George F. 75n35
Baudrier, Henri-Louis 547
Baumbach, Manuel 249n17
Bausi, Francesco 36n1, 36n2, 110n22, 112, 130n109, 180n7
Bayley, Charles C. 29n24
Beach, Jennifer A. 467n86
Beatrice, Pier Franco 448

- Beaujeu, Jean 306n214
 Beck, Mark 296n180
 Beeley, Christopher A. 361n399
 Behr, Charles A. 92n15, 95n25
 Beierwaltes, Werner 186n38, 189
 Bejczy, István 140n18, 140n21, 142n27, 144n36
 Bekker, Immanuel 353n355, 353n356,
 377n448
 Benakis, Linos G. 422n610
 Bene, Sándor xxxvii–xxxviii, 134–178
 Benoît, Pierre 464n75
 Berghof, Oliver 467n86
 Bernardi, Jean 339n307
 Berti, Enrico 344n318
 Besomi, Ottavio 27n20, 200n12
 Bett, Richard 248n15, 351n345
 Beyer, Hans-Veit 359n383
 Bianca, Concetta xxxv, 5–11
 Bianchi, Nunzio 23
 Bidez, Joseph 184n29, 304n205, 305n209,
 415n575, 463n75
 Billanovich, Giuseppe 475n107
 Birdsall, Neville 219n12
 Bíró, Csilla 146n44
 Birr, Kendall xviii
 Black, Antony 87n1
 Black, Robert xxxvin106, xxxvii, 107–133,
 557n4, 565n14
 Blair, Ann 39n12
 Bloch, R. Howard 485n148
 Bloomer, Martin 453
 Bluck, Richard Stanley 262n58, 264n67
 Blumenthal, Henry 295n177
 Blythe, James 13n7, 145n42
 Bobonich, Christopher 89n9
 Bock, Gisela 88n5
 Bodéüs, Richard 271n87
 Boehner, Philotheus 212n48, 579n29
 Boese, Helmut 180n4, 387n477
 Boisson, Didier 452n23
 Boka, László 146n44
 Bolz, Norbert 196n1
 Bonamente, Giorgio 449n11
 Bonazzi, Mauro 296n180, 297n182, 297n184
 Bond, Godfrey W. 256n37
 Bonner, Stanley F. 453n30
 Borgnet, Auguste 159n76
 Borsook, Eve 117n56, 123n79
 Boss, Gilbert 181n10
 Botley, Paul 10n14
 Bottari, Giovanni 5n11
 Boudignon, Christian 516n51, 516nn53–60,
 517nn62–7, 517n69
 Boudon-Millot, Véronique 301n200,
 387n477
 Boudouris, Konstantine I. 248n14, 254n34
 Bouillier, Francisque 223n25
 Boulgarakes, Elias 352n349
 Boulnois, Olivier 209n34
 Bouton-Touboullic, Anne-Isabelle 329n281
 Bowen, Anthony 316n241, 318n247, 319n252,
 327n275, 446n1, 488
 Bowie, Angus M. 259n46
 Bowman, Alan K. 461n69
 Boyle, Leonard OP xx
 Braakhuis, Henk 213n52
 Braccini, Tommaso 8
 Branca, Vittore 41n20
 Brancacci, Aldo 352n352
 Brandt, Samuel 316n240, 316n241, 317n243,
 317n244, 318n245, 318n248, 319n250,
 319n252, 327n275, 438, 458n56, 461n68
 Breen, Quirinus 209n35, 214n53
 Bréhier, Émile 293n168
 Bremmer, Jann 303n203, 303n205, 214n232,
 374n442
 Brémond, Émile 271n90, 271n91, 272n92,
 272n93, 272n94, 273n95, 273n96, 432
 Brenk, Frederik E. 295n177
 Brightman, Frank Edward 517n71
 Brittain, Charles 280, 319n253, 320, 433
 Broackes, Justin 268n78
 Brochard, Victor 298n187, 390n488
 Brown, Eric 94n22
 Brown, Garrett Wallace 97n26
 Brown, Peter 268n79
 Brown, Peter Robert Lamont 453n28,
 453n30, 458n55
 Brown, Stephen 579n29
 Brown, Virginia xvii, 26n12
 Broze, Michèle 186n38
 Brugnoli, Giorgio 38n10
 Bruns, Ivo 417n586
 Brunschwig, Jacques 292n165, 371n429,
 372n432
 Bryan, Jenny 269n81, 431

- Bryce, Archibald Hamilton 321n259,
 322n261, 323n262, 323n263, 323n264,
 324n266, 430
 Bryce, Jackson 319n253, 439, 447n2, 449n10,
 457n52
 Buckley Jr, William F. xv
 Bufano, Antonietta 151n55
 Buisson, Ferdinand 547
 Buitenwerf, Rieuwerd 463n73
 Bulović, Irenaios 380n452
 Bultmann, Rudolf 339n305
 Burckhardt, Jacob 135
 Bureau, Bruno 447n2
 Burelli-Bergese, Laura 277n110
 Buresch, Karl 463n73
 Burke, Peter 218n9
 Burnet, John 249n16
 Burns, James 87n1
 Burnyeat, Miles 270n84, 351n343
 Bursill-Hall, Geoffrey L. 553n1, 557n4, 558n3,
 559n7, 569n17, 570n16, 571n20, 577n28
 Bury, Emmanuel 233n48
 Bury, Robert Gregg 269n82, 291n159,
 311n224, 312n227, 323n228, 333n291,
 356n368, 357n371, 357n373, 394n505
 Busse, Adolf 355n365, 390n489, 405n540
 Butler, Shane 456n46
 Bydén, Börje 358n378, 358n381
 Bynon, Theodora 553n1
 Bywater, Ingram 276n109

 Cain, Andrew 459n59
 Calvente, Teresa Jiménez 486n151
 Cameron, Averil 466n83
 Campana, Agostino 9n33
 Campanelli, Maurizio 10n34, 10n35, 36n1
 Campbell, Hugh 321n259, 323n261, 323n262,
 323n263, 323n264, 324n266
 Camporeale, Salvatore O P xxviii n61, 481n131
 Canivet, Pierre 346n325
 Canning, Joseph 14n14
 Caplan, Harry 326n271
 Capo, Lidia 10n35
 Caquot, André 293n168
 Cardauns, Burkhart 281n130, 434, 435
 Cardini, Roberto 153n66
 Carey, Christopher 257n41, 268n79, 315n235
 Carraud, Cristophe 162n87, 166, 171

 Carroll, Thomas D. 306n211
 Caruso, Carlo 132n121
 Casamassima, Emanuele 12n2
 Casamenti, Silvestro 143n30
 Casey, Stephen 447n2, 448, 455n43, 482
 Casini, Lorenzo 208n32
 Casini, Paolo 244n3
 Catapano, Giovanni 141n24
 Caton, Jose Maria Fernandez 468n91
 Cavanagh, William G. 85n71
 Cavini, Walter 244n3
 Celenza, Christopher xxxv–xxxvi, 36–52
 Ceresa, Massimo 5n10, 10n34
 Cerri, Giovanni 259n45, 268n78, 292n163
 Cerulli, Emidio 10n35
 Chadwick, Henry 348n331, 388n482
 Charlet, Jean-Louis 36n1
 Chesterton, Gilbert Keith xxiii n28
 Chiaradonna, Riccardo 301n200
 Chines, Loredana 7n23
 Chrestou, Konstantinos Panagiotis 356n367,
 357n371, 357n372, 357n374, 357n375,
 365n410, 365n411, 378n449, 379n452,
 384n466, 388n482, 391n493, 392n497,
 392n498, 394n502, 394n503, 395n508,
 395n509, 396n512, 396n513, 397n516,
 402n532, 408n552, 512n38
 Christianson, Gerald 12n1, 15n16, 16n22
 Chrysos, Evangelos 76n39
 Cianfogni, Pier Nolasco 109n14, 109n15,
 128n96
 Ciccuto, Marcello 480n127
 Cinquini, Adolfo 8
 Classen, Carl Joachim 253n32
 Cleve, Felix M. 248n14
 Cockshaw, Pierre 182n18
 Code, Alan 278n117
 Cogan, Marc 202n15
 Cohalan, Florence xv
 Cohn, Leopold 287n152, 290n156, 290n157,
 291n58, 292n166, 293n169, 294n171,
 337n300, 337n301, 340n310, 345n322,
 359n384, 360n391, 373n440, 374n441,
 374n442, 375n443, 376n445, 377n449,
 386n477, 396n512
 Colantonio, Maria 268n78
 Collini, Stefan 105n43
 Colot, Blandine 447n2, 451n23

- Colson, Francis Henry 286n150, 287n151,
287n152, 288n153, 288n154, 289n155,
290n156, 290n157, 292n164, 294n171,
294n173, 340n310, 345n322, 374n442,
376n445, 381n455, 387n477, 396n512
- Congourdeau, Marie-Hélène 363n405
- Connell, William 112
- Constas, Nicholas 493n1, 493n3, 493n4
- Conticello, Carmelo G. 363n407, 379n452,
493n1
- Conticello, Vassa 363n407, 379n452, 493n1
- Copenhaver, Brian P. xxin9, xl–xli, 184n30,
199n9, 450n14, 546–604
- Corbato, Carlo 248n15
- Corcoran, Thomas H. 285n143
- Cosenza, Mario 38n8
- Cosgrove, Matthew R. 252n27
- Cotton, Hannah M. 461n69
- Coulon, Victor 257n39, 268n79
- Courcelle, Pierre 327n277
- Courtenay, William J. 197n3, 198n5, 214n54,
560n6
- Courtonne, Yves 385n473, 399n523
- Cousin, Victor 191n51
- Covington, Michael 553n1, 558n3
- Coxe, Arthur Cleveland 307n215, 370n429
- Cranz, Frederick 26n12
- Creed, John L. 449n11
- Creighton, Mandell 25n10
- Crevatin, Giuliana 170
- Crimi, Carmelo 336n298
- Crook, John Anthony 452n26
- Cross, Richard 152n61
- Crouzel, Henri 305n209
- Crubellier, Michel 278n117
- Cumont, Franz 415n575
- Curd, Patricia 246n10
- Cutinelli-Rèndina, Emanuele 132n124
- d'Alembert, Jean le Rond 244n3
- Dagron, Gilbert 69n9, 70n15
- Daley, Brian E. 331n289
- Daneloni, Alessandro 123n80
- Dangel, Jacqueline 447n2
- Darcus, Shirley M. 249n19
- Davidsohn, Robert 107n2
- Davies, Jonathan 4n8
- Davies, Martin 123n80
- de Asís Chavero Blanco, Francesco 471n98
- de Bary, W. Theodore 166n100
- de Conihout, Isabelle 547
- de Decker, Daniel 457n50
- de Ghellinck, Joseph 451
- de Gregorio, Giorgio 10n35
- de Jáuregui, Miguel Herrero 369n425
- de Lacy, Philip 295n175, 296n178, 297n182,
297n183
- de Libera, Alain 571n20
- De Marinis, Tammaro 117n57, 117n58, 118n60
- de Mendieta, Emmanuel Armand 410n559
- de Nichilo, Mauro 9n31
- De Petris, Alfonso xxiii n27
- de Quehen, Hugh 217n3
- de Rijk, Lambertus M. 557n5, 566n12
- De Simone, Maria Rosa 10n35
- de Vries–van der Velden, Eva 358n376
- Debus, Allen G. 184n30
- Decharneux, Baudouin 186n38
- Declercq, Gilles 447n2
- Decleva-Caizzi, Fernanda 248n14
- Defosse, Pol 462
- Deichgräber, Karl 256n37
- Deitz, Luc 55n6
- del Val, Ursino Dominguez 448n5
- Delacroix-Besnier, Claudine 493n1, 493n2,
496
- Delatte, Louis 381n455
- Delcominette, Sylvain 186n38
- Dell, Katharine 350n337
- della Rocca, Raimondo Morozzo 72n22,
72n23
- DellaNeva, JoAnn 489n156
- Dellis, John G. 352n349
- Demetracopoulos, John A. xxxix–xl,
243–445
- Demetrakopulos, Andronicus K. 366n417
- Demougeot, Émilienne 51n49
- den Boer, Willem 304n206
- Dendrinis, Charalambos J. 352n348,
408n555, 408n556, 409nn557–558,
410n560, 411n562, 411n563
- Denooz, Joseph 381n456
- DePalma Digeser, Elizabeth 316n239, 447n2,
448n6, 451n22, 456, 457, 464n75, 464n76
- Depew, David 273n96
- Derrida, Jacques 162, 163

- des Places, Édouard 274n102, 415n573
 Desbordes, François 364n408
 Descourtieux, Patrick 387n477
 Devonshire Jones, Rosemary 110n22
 Di Benedetto, Filippo 7n21
 Di Pierro, Carmine 36n1
 Dickenson, Jocelyn G. 23n1
 Diehl, Ernst 256n37, 270n83, 442
 Diels, Hermann 246n9, 250n23, 253n30,
 254n33, 256n37, 259n45, 262n57,
 273n98, 274, 275n104, 280n128, 285n146,
 300n197, 301n198, 323n265, 339n307,
 370n426, 371n429, 372n433, 429, 430,
 431, 433, 437, 438, 439, 443
 Diller, Aubrey 7n20
 Dillon, Emile J. 393n500
 Dillon, John M. 293n167
 Dilthey, Wilhelm 135
 Dinter, Jürgen 547
 Dionisotti, Carlo 10n34, 116n53
 Dobozý, Nóra 136n8
 Dods, Marcus 307n215, 308n216, 308n218,
 346n324
 Dombart Bernard 281n130, 282n131, 282n132,
 282n133, 435
 Donaldson, James 303n205, 307n215,
 316n241, 370n429
 Dorandi, Tiziano 348n331
 Dörrie, Heinrich 295n177
 Dotti, Ugo 160n79, 168, 171, 176
 Douglass, Scot 341n310
 Dover, Kenneth J. 257n38, 258n42, 258n43,
 258n44, 259n45, 261n52, 315n235,
 401n526, 401n527, 401n528, 402n529,
 402n530, 403n535, 430
 Drake, Harold A. 464n76
 Dressel, Albert Rudolf M. 310n220
 Dubois, Jean-Daniel 421n604
 Duffy, John M. 355n364
 Dunn, Diana 29n25
 Dupré-Theseider, Eugenio 107n2
 Dupront, Alphonse 220n16
 Düring, Ingemar 277n111, 278n115, 279n117
 Duval, Yves-Marie 459n59
 Duvick, Brian 489n156
 Ebbesen, Sten 363n408
 Ebgi, Raphael 186n38
 Eckey, Wilfried 343n318
 Eco, Umberto 203n20
 Edmonds, John Maxwell 248n15
 Edwards, Mark J. 344n319, 415n575,
 426n630, 448n7, 457n50
 Egli, Franziska 255n37
 Einarson, Benedict 295n175, 296n178,
 297n183
 Eisler, Robert 230n42
 Eleuteri, Paolo 7n20, 7n21
 Emery Jr., Kent 138n14
 Enenkel, Karl A.E. 160n79
 Engels, Joseph 364n408
 Engels, Friedrich 244n3
 Epstein, Ann W. 70n14
 Erbse, Harmut 463
 Etienne, Alexandre 186n38
 Eyssenhart, Franciscus 140n22
 Faes de Mottoni, Barbara 306n213, 447n2
 Fairbanks, Arthur 248n14
 Fanelli, Vittorio 10n35
 Fantazzi, Charles 54n3
 Farbaký, Péter 135n3
 Farenga, Paola 10n35
 Febvre, Lucien 21n44
 Fedalto, Giorgio 493n2
 Feibleman, James K. 378n449
 Feldman, Louis H. 217n7, 219n12
 Fenzi, Enrico 158n73, 158n74, 159n79
 Fera, Vincenzo 7n19, 10n34, 180n7
 Ferguson, Wallace K. 135n5, 159n79
 Ferraù, Gianvito 7
 Ferri, Feruccio 9n33
 Ferrini, Contardo 451n26
 Feser, Edward 106n44
 Festugière, André Marie Jean 321n258,
 342n314
 Fiaccadori, Gianfranco 7
 Fick, Nicole 453n30
 Figliuolo, Bruno 85n73
 Finkelberg, Aryeh 249n16, 260n49
 Fischer, Alexander A. 393n500
 Fish, Stanley xviii10
 FitzGerald, Augustine 373n437, 376n445
 Flamant, Jacques 328n277
 Fletcher, William 316n241, 318n247
 Flood, John L. 486n151

- Floridi, Luciano 351n345
 Flückiger, Hansueli 352n252, 354n357
 Fois, Mario S.J. xxviii n60
 Fontaine, Jacques 447n2, 458n53, 467, 469n92
 Fontanella, Francesca 95n25
 Fornaci, Maria G. 7n22
 Förstel, Christian 179n3
 Fortenbaugh, William W. 248n15
 Fosl, Peter S. 351n344
 Fowden, Garth 450n14, 455n44, 469n92
 Fowler, Henry North 270n87
 Fraknói, Vilmos 162n89
 Franceschini, Adriano 146n45
 Frank, Günter 213n51
 Fränkel, Hermann 252n27, 252n28, 256n37, 259n47, 260, 262, 284n140, 431
 Frankopan, Peter 67n2, 68n8, 75n36
 Frati, Lodovico 36n1
 Frazier, Françoise 296n180
 Frede, Dorothea 285n144, 293n167
 Frede, Michael 450n15
 Freund, Stefan 447n3, 455n44, 463n74, 463n75, 483n140
 Friedlein, Gottfried 387n477
 Friedrich, Anne 449n10
 Friedrich, Markus 202n16
 Früchtel, Ludwig 387n477, 414n573
 Fubini, Riccardo xxviii n61, 37n7, 477n118, 464n124
 Fuentes González, Pedro Pablo 272n94
 Fusco, Franca 449n12
 Fyfe, W. Hamilton 276n108
 Fyrigos, Antonis 364n408, 390n489

 Gabriel, Astrik L. 136n7
 Gaeta, Franco 112n27
 Gál, Gedeon 579n29
 Gallay, Paul 304n207, 331n288, 333n292, 334n294, 338n304, 341n310, 342n312, 343n315, 344n321, 346n326, 354n360, 440, 511n35
 Gallop, David 264n65
 Gallou, Chrysanthi 85n71
 Gambassi, Osvaldo 107n14
 Gams, Pius B. 17n23
 Ganchou, Thierry 83n66
 Garand, Monique-Cécile 182n18
 Garcia, Jorge J. E. 203n20
 Garfagnini, Giancarlo 179n3, 186n38, 477n116
 Gargan, Luciano 153n66, 154n69, 161n82
 Garin, Eugenio 192n53, 480n128
 Garnsey, Peter 316n241, 318n247, 319n252, 327n275, 446n1, 461n69, 488
 Garraud, Vincent 243n1
 Garrett, Jan 271n87
 Garstad, Benjamin xvi n9
 Garzya, Antonius 372n436, 376n444, 376n445
 Gaspari, Luca 319n249
 Gaudemet, Jean 452n26
 Geanakoplos, Deno J. xx, 4n5
 Géhin, Paul 348n332
 Gemeinhardt, Peter 392n494
 Gemmelli Marciano, Laura 252n29
 Gentile, Sebastiano 36n1, 179n3, 180, 183, 184n26, 185n32, 485n148
 George, William 13n9
 Georgiadis, Mercourios 85n71
 Gerard, David 21n44
 Gerolymatou, Maria 68n5, 78n50, 79n52
 Gersch, Stephen 179
 Gerstel, Sharon 71n19
 Gerth, Bernhard 251n25, 343n317
 Giannachi, Francesco xxiii n29
 Gieben, Servus OFM Cap. 471n98, 472n100, 472n101, 472n102, 473
 Giessauf, Johannes 24n2
 Gieysztor, Aleksander 136n7
 Gigon, Olof 447n2
 Gilbert, Felix 110n22
 Gill, Christopher 301n200
 Gill, Joseph 21n39, 493n1
 Gilli, Patrick 5n9
 Gionta, Daniella 5, 6n16
 Girgenti, Giuseppe 327n277
 Giulea, Dragos A. 289n155
 Glorieux, Palémon 476n111, 476n112, 476n113, 476n114
 Golden, Leon 276n109
 Goldie, Mark 87n1
 Gollrad, Gareth Evan 472n99
 Golubovich, Girolamo 494n8
 Gomme, Arnold Wycombe 261n52
 Goodman, Martin 448n7, 461n69

- Goodspeed, Edgar J. 313n229
 Gordon, Phyllis 474n104
 Goulet, Richard 272n94, 273n97, 353n355, 448n6
 Goulon, Alain 447n2, 447n3
 Govaerts, Susanne 381n456
 Graefenhan, Augustus Guilelmus 276n106, 276n109
 Grafton, Anthony 217n5, 219, 220n15, 228n39
 Graham, Daniel W. 246n10, 247n12
 Gramsch, Robert 18n28
 Granger, Herbert 243n31
 Grant, Robert M. 303n204, 306n212, 307n215, 308n216, 308n218, 438
 Grassi, Vittorino 465n82
 Green, Lawrence 63
 Green, William M. 281n130, 282n131, 282n132, 282n133
 Grell, Chantel 218n8
 Griffiths, Gordon 5n12, 13n8, 475n109
 Gualdo, Germano 5n12, 17n23
 Guellouz, Suzanne 220n16
 Guetter, David L. 269n81, 431
 Guidi, Andrea 110n22, 111n23, 111n25
 Guillaumin, Jean-Yves 447n2
 Guillaumin, Marie-Louise 457n50
 Guillou, André 3
 Günsenin, Nergis 75n35
 Gutas, Dimitri 276n107
 Güthenke, Constanze 276n106
 Guthrie, William Keith Chambers 248n15, 254n33, 255n36, 268n79
 Gutkowski, Andrzej 8n25

 Haase, Wolfgang 295n177, 337n301
 Hadas-Lebel, Mireille 217n6, 218n8, 218n9, 293n168
 Hadas, Moses 252n28
 Hadot, Ilsetraut 272n92
 Hadot, Pierre 324, 326, 330n282, 331n289
 Hagedorn, Dieter 350n337
 Hagedorn, Ursula 350n337, 414n573
 Hagedahl, Harald 281n130, 458n54
 Hägg, Fiskå Henny 345n323
 Hahn, E. Adelaide 343n317
 Hain, Ludwig 546
 Haldane, Elizabeth 223n22
 Haldon, John 67n2, 68n3, 70n15, 72n25

 Hale, John R. 27n16
 Hall, Muriel 467n86
 Hall, Stuart G. 341n310, 388n479, 425n628
 Halliday, William R. 258n43
 Halliwell, Stephen 276n108, 277n110
 Hammer, Olav 415n575
 Hanke, Lewis 22n47
 Hankins, James xxiin24, xxxvii, 13n8, 14n12, 22n45, 36n1, 43n28, 87–106, 135n6, 138n13, 145n37, 145n42, 182n16, 475n109, 479n124, 479n125, 479n126, 481n133
 Hankinson, Robert J. 201n200, 387n477
 Hardison, O.B. 276n109
 Harlow, Barbara 163n90
 Harries, Jill 452n26
 Harris, Jonathan 352n348
 Harris, William V. 95n25
 Harvalia-Crook, Eirene 352n348
 Harvey, David 257n41
 Hastings, James 463n73
 Hata, Gohei 217n7
 Hausherr, Irénée 396n514
 Hayduck, Michael 386n476, 405n540
 Hayek, Friedrich 97
 Head, Constance 24n3
 Heater, Derek 88n7
 Heck, Eberhard 244n2, 316n240, 316n241, 317n243, 317n244, 318n245, 318n248, 319n250, 319n252, 446n1, 447n3, 451n22, 457, 459n59, 470n94
 Heffernan, George 302n201
 Heil, Günter 330n282, 330n285
 Heine, Heinrich 393n499
 Heinimann, Felix 261n52
 Heitsch, Ernst 246n9, 247n11, 247n13, 248n15, 339n305
 Held, David 97n26
 Helmuth, Johannes 12n3, 13n6
 Helmreich, Georg 390n487
 Henderson, Duane R. 20n38
 Henderson, Jeffrey 257n39, 258n42, 258n44
 Henry, Paul 325n268, 337n302
 Henry, René 353n356, 377n448
 Hense, Otto 283n138, 313n229
 Hensels, Paul 343n316
 Hermann, Gottfried 276n106
 Herren, Michael W. 26n11

- Herrin, Judith 352n348
 Herrmann, Max 486n151, 488
 Hershbelle, Jackson H. 297n182
 Herzog, Reinhart 448n6
 Heylbut, Gustavus 386n476
 Hicks, Robert Drew 253n30, 300n197, 370n428
 Hiller, Joseph 486n151, 487n153, 488
 Hine, Harry M. 285n143, 434
 Hinterberger, Martin xl, 377n449, 492–545
 Hobbins, Daniel 21n43, 461n111
 Hobson, Anthony 10n35
 Hocedez, Edgar 559n9
 Hofmann, Georgius 4, 493n5
 Holl, Karl 250n20, 274n99, 442
 Holmes, Brooke 95n25
 Honnefelder, Ludger 203n20
 Hornblower, Simon 261n52
 Hornqvist, Mikael 88n6
 Horowitz, Tamara 387n477
 Horstmannshoff, H.F.J. (Manfred) 387n477
 Horváth Jr., János 138
 House, Dennis K. 298n187
 Hübener, Wolfgang 185n1
 Huby, Pamela 253n32
 Huffman, Carl 252n29
 Hunt, Richard 181n14
 Hušek, Vit 349n451
 Hussey, Edward 246n10
 Hysztli, József 135n4
- Idel, Moshe 221n19
 Ierodiakonou, Katerina 358n378, 363n408, 387n477
 Inglese, Giorgio 130n107, 130n108
 Ingreneau, Christiane 318n246, 318n247, 319n249, 319n251, 441, 446n1, 448n6
 Inman, Ross 581n33
 Innes, Doreen C. 276n108
 Innocenti, Annalisa 113n33
 Inwood, Brad 283n135, 285n144, 435
 Ioli, Roberta 247n13, 256n37, 301n199, 343n317
 Ippolito, Antonella 325n269, 326n270, 326n271, 440
 Israel, Jonathan 220n16, 225n28, 245n6
 Izbicki, Thomas xxxv, 12–22
- Jackson, Belford D. 364n408
 Jackson, John 228n35
 Jacoby, David xxxvi, 67–86
 Jaeger, Werner 273n95, 279n119, 341n310, 372n435, 380n454, 388n479, 425n628
 James, Alan 249n17
 Janis, Allen Ira 387n477
 Jankovics, József 136n7
 Jedan, Christoph 314n232
 Joachimsohn, Paul 12n1
 Jocelyn, Henry David 281n130
 Jodogne, Pierre 182n18
 Jones, Henry Stuart 260n51, 430
 Jones, Howard 304n207
 Jones, John D. 330n283
 Jones, Lindsay 243n1
 Jones, William Henry Samuel 260n48
 Jordan, Mark D. 455n41
 Jouanna, Jacques 259n47, 430
 Jourjon, Maurice 304n207, 331n288, 333n292, 334n294, 338n304, 340n310, 342n312, 343n315, 344n321, 346n326, 354n360, 440
 Jugie, Martin 412n565, 444
 Juhász, László 135n4
 Jurdjevic, Mark 100n32
- Kaczmarek, Ludger 560n6, 575n26, 576n24
 Kahn, Charles H. 248n15, 283n135, 284n139
 Kaibel, Georg 256n37
 Kaimakes, Demetrios B. 398n519
 Kaiser, Otto 339n305
 Kalb, Alfons 281n130, 435
 Kaldellis, Anthony 354n362
 Kallendorf, Craig W. 271n19, 475n110
 Kalligas, Haris A. 77n41, 82n62
 Kalphas, Basileios 268n80
 Kamesar, Adam 293n168
 Kaplan, Michel 74n31
 Kaplan, Yosef 221n19
 Kapriev, Georgi 362n400
 Karamanolis, George 378n451
 Karasmanis, Vassilis 268n79
 Kardos, Tibor 135n5
 Karfiková, Lenka 341n310, 388n479, 425n628
 Karsten, Simon 246n9, 276n106, 284, 429
 Kaster, Robert A. 38n10
 Katz, David 221n19

- Kazhdan, Aleksandr 70n14
 Kecskeméti, Gábor 136n8, 164n96, 165n99
 Keil, Gundolf 486n151
 Keil, Heinrich 574n21
 Kelley, Donald 220n18
 Kelley, Nicole 311n223, 314n231, 314n232
 Kempshall, Matthew 102n36
 Kennedy, Leonard 200n12
 Kenny, Anthony 143n31
 Kentrotos, Giorgos 271n87
 Kerferd, George 253n32, 261n52
 Kertsch, Manfred 340n308
 Kessler, Eckhard 160n81, 184n30, 196n1,
 199n8, 202n16
 Kidd, Ian Gray 329n280
 Kierkegaard, Søren 244
 Kim, Sung Bok xxi
 King, Peter 471n97
 Kingsbury, Benedict 88n6
 Kirk, Geoffrey S. 252n28
 Kirwan, Christopher 302n201
 Kislinger, Ewald 75n34, 75n35, 81n58
 Kiss, Farkas Gábor 135n4
 Kisslinger, Jerry 166n100
 Kist, Nicholas C. 145n41
 Kittel, Ellen E. 74n29
 Kizenko, Nadia xiiin2
 Klaniczay, Tibor 136n7, 139n17, 164,
 165n97
 Klecha, Gerhard 486n151, 488n155
 Kleingeld, Pauline 94n22
 Kleinstuber, Joy A. 233n48
 Klibansky, Raymond 181n10, 181n14, 190
 Klosko, George 89n9
 Knowles, David xiiin1
 Knox, Dilwyn 20n27
 Koder, Johannes 75n34, 75n35, 81n58
 Koets, Peter John 375n442
 Kokkinos, Philotheos 398n519
 Kolovou, Foteini 71n16
 Koltay-Kastner, Jenő 135n5
 Komonchak, Joseph xiv
 Kondylis, Panagiotis 244n3
 Koniaris, George L. 300n196
 Kooper, John M. 279n123, 280
 Korobeinikov, Dimitri xx
 Kotter, Bonifatius 352n350, 352n351,
 353n354, 397n1515, 51n35
 Kranz, Walther 246n9, 250n23, 253n30,
 254n33, 256n37, 259n45, 262n57,
 273n98, 274, 275n104, 280n128, 285n146,
 300n197, 301n198, 323n265, 339n307,
 370n426, 371n429, 372n433, 429, 430,
 431, 433, 436, 438, 439, 443
 Krappe, Alexander Haggerty 230n42
 Kraut, Richard 105n41
 Kraye, Jill 14n12, 140n19, 184n30
 Kretzmann, Norman 143n31
 Krey, Philip D. 16n22
 Kristeller, Paul Oskar xvi, xvii, xx, xxii, xxiii,
 xxiv, xxviii, xxxiv, xxxviii, 6n18, 26n12,
 27n18, 136n7, 138n15, 145n37, 145n39,
 151n58, 162, 163, 165, 179n1, 180, 182n17,
 182n19, 183n21, 183n25, 183n26, 184,
 185n34, 195
 Kroll, Wilhelm 184, 185n35, 415n575
 Kühn, Carl Gottlob 301n200, 387n477, 436,
 438
 Kuhn, Heinrich C. 160n81
 Kühner, Raphael 251n25, 343n317
 Kuksewicz, Zdislaw 143n31
 Külzer, Andreas 75n34, 75n35, 81n58
 Küng, Hans xivn4
 La Monaco, Francesco 117n58
 Labowsky, Lotte 82n9, 181n10
 Lacoste, Jean-Yves 243n1
 Lafontaine, Guy 304n207, 361n394,
 380n454
 Lagarde, Bernadette 419n595, 422n610
 Lagerlund, Henrik 244n5, 302n201, 356n370
 Lagrée, Jacqueline 225n28
 Laiou, Angeliki E. 67n2, 68n4, 68n6, 68n8,
 69n10, 70n12, 72n26, 74n28, 76n38,
 77n43, 77n45, 78n49, 79n55, 80n56,
 80n57, 82n59, 83n65, 85n72
 Laks, André 278n116, 279, 285n144, 293n167,
 339n305, 433
 Lamb, George 453n30
 Lamb, Walter Rangeley Maitland 262n59,
 264n65, 264n67, 265n70, 267n77
 Lambertini, Roberto 143n30
 Lami, Giovanni 108n6
 Langerbeck, Hermann 388n479
 Lanzi, Silvia 296n180
 Laplanche, François 218n8

- Lappin, Anthony J. 26n12
 Larchet, Jean-Claude 337n299
 Larson, Pär 108n9, 109n10
 Laubmann, Georg 458n56
 Laudani, Raffaele 163n90
 Laurent, Marie-Hyacinthe 3
 Lazzari, Alfonso 110n22
 Lazzarin, Francesca 182n15, 186n38, 186n38
 Le Goff, Jacques 472n99
 Leadbetter, William 453n32
 Leanza, Sandro 348n332
 Leão, Delfim F. 296n180
 Lebedev, Andrei 292n163
 Lee Too, Yun 271n88
 Lefort, Jacques 74n31
 Lennon, Thomas M. 223n25, 225n28
 Leoncini, Giovanni 146n45
 Leone, Pietro Luigi M. 359n385, 360n387,
 360n388, 360n389, 360n390, 361n393,
 361n394, 361n397, 361n398, 422n610, 442
 Leshner, James H. 245n8, 246n10, 247n11,
 247n12, 248n15, 250n24, 253n31, 254n34,
 255n35, 256n37, 257n40, 262, 263,
 264n66, 264n67, 265n69, 284n139,
 294n174, 323n265, 407n545, 431
 Leveils, Xavier 308n217
 Levine, Joseph M. 219n13
 Lévy, Carlos 291n162, 293n168
 Lewis, Eric 223n25
 Lewis, James R. 415n575
 Lewis, W.J. 467n86
 Leyser, Conrad 466n85
 Ligota, Christopher R. 220n16
 Lilla, Salvatore 296n180, 330n284, 330n285,
 330n286, 343n316, 382n459
 Lindsay, Wallace Martin 39n13, 467n86
 Litta, Pompeo 120n66, 124n81
 Little, Lester K. 472n99
 Littlewood, Antony Robert 355n363,
 405n540
 Lloyd, Geoffrey Ernest Richard 270
 Loenertz, Raymond 3, 402n534
 Lohr, Charles 22n47
 Loi, Vincenzo 447n2
 Lombardo, Antonino 72n22, 72n23
 Long, Anthony A. 94n22, 247n12, 293n167,
 301n199
 Longpré, André 160n79, 171
 López Cruces, Juan Luis 272n94
 Losacco, Margherita 182n18
 Louguet, Claire 339n305
 Louth, Andrew 448n7, 352n348
 Lucas, Donald W. 277n109
 Luna, Concetta 181n11, 426n630
 Lupher, David 88n6
 Lux, David 222n20
 Macfarlane, Katherine Nell 467n87
 Machuca, Diego 291n160, 298n187, 298n188,
 333n291
 Mack, Peter xxxvi, 53–63, 202, 204n21,
 205n24, 213n50
 Maclean, Ian 202n16
 Macleod, Matthew Donald 258n43,
 422n607, 422n608, 422n610
 Macmahon, John Henry 370n429
 MacMullen, Ramsey 449n12, 452n26,
 457n52, 460n64
 MacQueen, John 32n31
 Maczelka, Csaba 138n12
 Madden, Thomas F. 74n29
 Maes, Yanick 40n14
 Magazzù, Cesare 467n87
 Magdalino, Paul 69n9, 69n10, 70n12, 70n13,
 74n30, 75n32, 75n33, 77n43, 79n54
 Maia Neto, José R. 244n3, 244n4
 Maier, Ida 48n45
 Maisano, Riccardo 383n461
 Malingrey, Anne-Marie 402n533
 Malone, Andrew S. 339n305
 Maltezou, Chryssa 70n13, 182n18, 493n1
 Mandalari, Mario 4
 Manfredini, Mario 7n20
 Mango, Cyril 69n9
 Mango, Marlia Mundell 72n20
 Maniatis, George C. 79n52
 Manselli, Raoul 139, 151, 154, 161
 Mansfeld, Jaap 284n141, 292n165, 292n167,
 301n198, 301n199, 329n280, 372n432
 Mantzaridis, Georgios 512n38
 Marchand, Jean-Jacques 110n21
 Marchant, Edgar C. 380n452
 Marchesi, Concetto 321n259, 322n260,
 323n262, 323n263, 323n264, 324n266,
 440
 Marchiaro, Michelangiola 36n1

- Marcovich, Miroslav 253n30, 255n37,
300n197, 300n198, 304n207, 310n220,
315n235, 345n324, 369n425, 370n428,
370n429, 378n449, 438
- Mareschal, Pierre 547
- Margolin, Jean-Claude 54n3
- Markos, Antonios G. 277n112, 433
- Markus, Robert A. 295n177, 364n408
- Marmo, Constantino 203n20
- Marosi, Ernő 135n3
- Marrou, Henri I. 453n30
- Marsh, David 484n7
- Marshall, John 97n27
- Marshall, Peter 467n86
- Martelli, Mario 10n34
- Martellotti, Guido 151n55, 169
- Martin, Denis D. 146n43, 162n86
- Martin, Henri-Jean 21n43
- Martin, Jean 387n477
- Martín, José Pablo 308n217
- Martin, Michael 374n442
- Märtl, Claudia 24n2
- Marx, Karl 244n3
- Maslowski, Tadeusz 448n3
- Mastrogianni, Anna 36n1
- Matheus, Michael 8n27
- Mathieu, Georges 271n90, 271n91, 272n92,
272n93, 272n94, 273n95, 273n96, 432
- Mathieu, Jean-Marie 330n282
- Matschke, Klaus-Peter 80, 81n58, 83n63
- Matsoukas, Nikolaos 365n411, 367n418,
367n420, 368n421, 368n423, 368n424,
372n436, 373n438, 373n439, 376n447,
377n448, 378n449, 378n450, 380n453,
380n454, 382, 444, 512n38
- Matthewson, Tom 166n100
- Matyáš, Havrdáš 379n451
- Mau, Jürgen 246n9, 311n224, 311n225,
312n226, 313n228, 314n230, 315n235,
333n291, 356n369, 357n371, 357n373,
358n377, 361n395, 385n472, 389n483,
394n505, 394n506, 420n600, 422n609,
423n618, 424n621, 436
- Mazzocco, Angelo 135n6, 163n93, 164n94,
164n95
- Mazzotta, Giuseppe 158n74
- McCabe, Robert V. 393n500
- McDonough, James 410n559
- McGrath, Alister E. 197n4
- McGuckin, John A. 331n289, 451n18
- McGuckin, Paul 450n13, 451n23
- McGuire, Brian Patrick 476n111
- McManamon, John M. 27n15, 27n16
- McNeile, Alan Hugh 393n500
- Méchoulán, Henry 221n19
- Meerhoff, Kees G. 213n51
- Megna, Paola 180n7
- Meier, John P. xiv
- Mejer, Jørgen 371n429
- Mercati, Giovanni 8n27, 400n524, 400n525,
402n534, 404n537
- Mercuri, Simona 119n63
- Merkel, Ingrid 184n30
- Merkelbach, Reinhold 258n43
- Meroi, Fabrizio 182n16
- Meserve, Margaret 88n6, 24n3
- Messina, Gaetano 248n13, 339n307
- Metz, Johann Baptist xivn4
- Metzger, Ernest 452n26
- Meyendorff, John 365n410, 378n449, 402n530
- Miethke, Jürgen 143n32, 150n52
- Miglio, Massimo 6n18, 485n148, 485n150
- Mill, John Stuart 105
- Miller, Isaac 293n169
- Milovanovic-Barham, Čelica 336n298
- Mioni, Elpidio 11n36
- Mirhady, David C. 271n88
- Mitchell, Rosamond Joscelyne 12n4, 24n3,
25n10
- Modigliani, Anna 485n148
- Moffatt, James 463n73
- Mogyoródi, Ernese 248n13, 339n305
- Mohr, Richard D. 247n12
- Moles, John 94n22
- Mommsen, Theodor E. xx, 459n60
- Monat, Pierre 451n23
- Mondésert, Claude 369n425, 378n449
- Mondolfo, Rodolfo 248n15
- Monfasani, John xiii–xxxiv, xxxvi, xxxvii,
xxxviii, xxxix, xlii–lx, 4, 5n13, 6n14,
7n23, 20n36, 53, 61n10, 63, 87n2, 87n4,
89n10, 93n18, 93n19, 134, 135, 138n13, 162,
164, 165, 166n100, 178*, 181n13, 181n14,
182n17, 182n18, 196n1, 197n4, 198n7, 199,
205n24, 216*, 491n158, 492, 551, 552n17
- Monod, Albert 220n16, 220n17

- Montefusco, Lucia Calboli 61, 62n14
 Moore-Blunt, Jennifer 265n72
 Morel, Frederic 345n324, 347n327, 347n328,
 348n330, 442, 508n24
 Moreni, Domenico 108n10, 109n11, 109n15,
 110n16, 110n17, 110n19, 110n20, 114n37,
 114n38, 116n52
 Moreschini, Claudio 331n289, 334n296,
 366n415, 382n459
 Morgan, Gareth 83n63
 Morisson, Cécile 68n6, 68n8, 69n10, 70n12,
 72n26, 77n43, 77n45, 82n59, 83n65,
 85n72
 Mossay, Justin 304n207, 361n394,
 380n454
 Mottahedeh, Roy Parviz 74n28, 80n56
 Mourelatos, Alexander P.D. 247n12, 252n27,
 269n81, 269n82, 270n84, 431, 433
 Muhlack, Ulrich 13n6
 Mullach, Friedrich Wilhelm Allen 283n138,
 313n229, 434
 Müllner, Karl 483n139
 Munn, Mark 260n51
 Münscher, Karl 273n96
 Murat, Michel 447n2
 Murauer, Rainer 24n2
 Murphy, Roland E. 393n500
 Murray, Augustus Taber 249n18
 Musial, Stanislas 214n52
 Mutschmann, Hermann 246n9, 291n159,
 292n165, 298n190, 312n227, 314n230,
 339n306, 356n368, 358n377, 363n408,
 370n428, 389n483, 396n512, 418n587,
 423n618, 424n620, 435
 Myans y Siscar, Gregorio 206n25

 Nadal Cañellas, Joan 379n452, 402n528,
 403n536, 404n538
 Nadal, Joseph Cyprien 528n7
 Nauck, Augustus 255n37
 Nauert, Charles G. 161n83
 Nauta, Lodi xxviii56, xxxviii-xxxix,
 196-215, 480n130, 576n23
 Nautin, Pierre 460n62, 461n66
 Neal, George 253n32
 Nederman, Cary J. 20n37, 140n18
 Negri, Giulio 28n8, 120n64
 Nehamas, Alexander 163n90, 262n61
 Neri, Moreno 324n267

 Neschke-Hentschke, Ada B. 186n38
 Nestle, Wilhelm 246n10, 261n52
 Neuhausen, Karl August 8n29
 Niccolai, Alberto 122n77
 Niccoli, Sandra 180n7
 Nicholas, John M. 225n28
 Nicholson, Oliver 448n7, 449n9, 450n15,
 452n27, 453n28, 457n50, 457n52,
 463n74, 464n79, 483n140
 Nickau, Klaus 419n593
 Niderst, Alain 220n16
 Niese, Benedictus 304n206
 Nietzsche, Friedrich 162
 Niftanidou, Theocharoula M. 276n106
 Nightingale, Andrea 278n117
 Nisard, Charles 221n19
 Niutta, Francesco 10n35
 Nock, Arthur Darby 342n314, 381n457
 Nodes, Daniel J. 36n1
 Nollac, Pierre 161n82
 Noone, Timothy B. 203n20
 Norlin, George 271n90, 272n94
 Normore, Calvin 59n56
 Norris, Frederick 333n292
 Novak, Lukas 581n33
 Nozick, Robert 97

 O'Callaghan, Joseph xv
 O'Connell, Monique 88n6
 Oakesmith, John 296n180
 Oakley, Francis 14n13
 Obbink, Dirk 304n208, 374n442
 Oberhelman, Steven 91n12
 Obermann, Heiko 560n6
 Oikonomides, Nicolas 67n2, 70n15, 80n57,
 82n60
 Oikonomos, Sophokles K. 383n464,
 384n466, 385n469
 Olin, John C. xv, xvi
 Olschki, Cesare 121n70
 Oosterhuis, David K. 30n26
 Opsomer, Jan 279n123, 297n185
 Orsi, Robert xiiin1
 Osborne, Carroll D. 429
 Osborne, Catherine 371n429
 Otto, Johann Carl Theodor 339n306,
 345n324, 442
 Ouy, Gilbert 476n111

- Pade, Marianne 26n12, 27n20
Pagani, Fabio 416n582
Paganini, Gianni 244n3, 244n4
Pagden, Anthony 88n6
Pagliaroli, Stefano 10n36
Pagnoni, Maria Rita 304n208
Palau, Annaclara Cataldi 10n36
Palmer, Frank R. 553n1
Palmer, Gerald Eustace Howell 395n509, 398n517
Palmer, John A. 252n28, 256n37, 259n47, 262n57, 280, 319n253, 320, 430, 433
Panaccio, Claude 200n13
Panagopoulos, Georgios D. 283n137
Panichi, Nicola 297n181
Panizza, Letizia A. 480n130
Paolini, Adriana 28n22
Paolini, Cipriano 158n73
Papagianni, Eleutheria 79n53
Papanicolaou, Maria 184n31
Papathomopoulos, Manoles 364n408
Papy, Jan 40n14, 202n19
Paredi, Angelo 479n124
Parenti, Giovanni 114n36
Parrett, Herman 560n6
Partner, Peter 17n23
Paschini, Pio 10n34
Paschke, Franz 303n204
Pasnau, Robert 208n32, 364n408
Patterson, Richard 267n77
Paul, James Balfour 24n5
Pazarski, Maria I. 393n500
Pélissier, Leon 233n48
Pellegrin, Elisabeth 161n82
Pellissier, Augustin 413n569
Penelhum, Terence 244n3
Penman, Michael 24n5
Pépin, Jean 342n314
Pérez, Brigitte 353n355
Pernot, Laurent 95n25
Perosa, Alessandro 117n57, 117n58, 118n60
Perrin, Michel 446n1, 447n2, 451n17, 459n59
Perusino, Franca 268n78
Pesavento, Luisa 145
Peterson, Peter 303n205, 310n220, 315n237
Petit, Françoise 288n152
Petit, Louis 412n565, 413n568, 444, 495, 516nn57–8, 516n60, 517n61, 517n65, 517n72, 517n74, 529nn113–115, 541n161, 543n165
Pettas, William A. 118n59, 119n60, 119n63, 120n64, 122n74, 122n75, 122n76, 129n102
Pettegree, Andrew 21n44, 546
Pettit, Philip 88n5
Peverada, Enrico 153n66
Pfeiffer, Robert H. 393n500
Phanourgakes, Basileios D. 408n552
Philippousis, John 254n34
Piana, Celestino 109n14
Pichon, René 447, 448n4, 457n50
Pietrobelli, Antoine 301n200
Pietrosanti, Paolo 358n381
Pinborg, Jan 143n31, 560n6
Pincelli, Agata 10n35
Pinto-Mathieu, Elisabeth 452n23
Piovan, Francesco 38n8
Pissavino, Paolo Costantino 135n5, 145n37
Plasberg, Otto 280n124, 280n128, 432
Plátová, Jana 379n451
Pocock, John G.A. 220n17
Podskalsky, Gerhard 366n417
Pohl, Hans 12n3
Pohlenz, Max 259n47, 293n168, 297n183, 431
Poinssotte, Jean-Michel 446n2
Polemis, Ioannis 362n400
Polizzotto, Lorenzo 126n91
Poltera, Orlando 296n179
Pomaro, Gabriella 477
Ponte, Giovanni 148n48
Popkin, Richard Henry 221n19, 225n28, 243n1, 244n3
Post, Werner 305n210
Poulakos, Takis 273n95
Powell, John Enoch 260n51, 430
Pozzoni, Ivan 298n191
Pratesi, Alessandro 182n18
Preus, Anthony 246n10
Price, Simon 448n7, 461n69
Procaccioli, Paolo 116n52
Pseutogkas, Vassilios 512n38
Purnell Jr., Frederick 138n13
Pusey, Philip Edward 530nn120–130
Quint, David 37n7
Quondam, Amedeo 164n95

- Rabe, Hugo 326n272
 Rabil, Jr., Albert 4n5, 9m13
 Rackham, Harris 371n429, 417n584
 Rahner, Karl 305n210
 Ramelli, Ilaria 313n229, 324n267, 327n276,
 328n278
 Randall, John H. 306n214
 Rando, Daniela 28n22
 Rapetti, Elena 223n25
 Raponi, Nicola 478n119
 Ratti, Stéphane 447n2
 Raven, John E. 252n28
 Reale, Giovanni 327n277
 Regoliosi, Mariangela 27n20, 153n66,
 200n12, 480n128
 Rehm, Bernhard 303n204, 303n205,
 310n220, 311n221, 313n229, 314n233,
 314n234, 315n238, 440
 Reifferscheid, August 321n259, 322n260,
 323n262, 323n263, 323n264, 324n266
 Reinhardt, Karl 252n27, 253, 431
 Reinhart, Max 486n151
 Reiter, Siegfried 386n477
 Renaudet, Augustin 548n7, 550n12
 Repici, Luciana 6n16
 Reydellet, Marc 452n86
 Riaud, Jean 293n168
 Ribémont, Bernard 468n90
 Rice, Eugene xvi, xvii–xviii, xix, xxii
 Richa, Giuseppe 111n26
 Richard, Anne 331n289
 Riché, Pierre 465n80
 Rigo, Antonio 353n353, 379n452, 391n493,
 397n516
 Rigotti, Gianpaolo 364n408
 Risch, Franz Xaver 310n220
 Rist, John M. 302n201
 Ritter, Adolf Martin 330n283, 330n285,
 447n2
 Rius-Camps, Josep 303n203
 Rivier, André 247n12, 283n134, 284n139
 Roberts, Alexander 303n205, 307n215,
 316n241, 370n429
 Roberts, Louis xxi
 Roberts, W. Rhys 276n108
 Robin, Leon 266n76
 Rollo, Antonio 7n23
 Romano, Francesco 186n38
 Rondeau, Marie-Joseph 375n443
 Roots, Peter 447n2, 449n9, 458, 459n57
 Rose, Valentin 417n585
 Rosenberg, Charles M. 146n45
 Ross, G.R.T. 223n22
 Ross, William David 256n37, 277n113,
 278n117
 Rossi, Luca Carlo 169
 Rossini, Orietta 485n148
 Rostagni, Augusto 275n106
 Rotondi Secchi Tarugi, Luisa 25n8, 148n48
 Rotondi, Giuseppe 162n87, 166, 171, 475n107
 Rousseau, Philip 466n85
 Roussel, Bernard 421n604
 Röß, Andreas 382n459
 Rowe, Christopher 94n22
 Rowe, John Gordon 159n79
 Royaards, Herman J. 145n41
 Rudberg, Stig Y. 410n559
 Ruh, Kurt 486n151
 Rummel, Erika 212n47
 Rundle, David xxxv, 23–35
 Runia, David T. 286n149, 293n167, 293n168,
 294n172, 308n217, 329n280, 340n310,
 345n323, 376n446, 388n482
 Ruocco, Ilario 181n14
 Russell, Donald 276n108
 Russell, Norman 351n342
 Rutherford, David xl, 431–476
 Rzach, Aloisius 463n73
 Sabbadini, Remigio 26n14
 Saffrey, Henri Dominique OP 182n18,
 183n22, 183n24, 189, 190n48, 348n331,
 426n630
 Saladin, Jean-Christophe 10n35
 Salazar, Joseph-Phillipe 221n19
 Salomon, Hermann xxin15
 Samaritani, Antonio 137n10, 153n68
 Santagata, Marco 159n79
 Sassi, Maria Michela 248n13
 Sattler, Barbara M. 247n12
 Saxby, Michael 358n376
 Scafì, Alessandro 20n38
 Schabel, Chris xxi, xl, 377n449, 492–545
 Schäfer, Christian 248n15, 284n140
 Schönberger, Rolf 196n1
 Schennach, Martin 24n2

- Schingnitz, Christoph 20n38
 Schiró, Giuseppe 365n412
 Schlebusch, Karl 108n7, 114n39, 114n40,
 114n41, 115n45, 116n5, 116n52, 120n65
 Schmaltz, Tad 223n25
 Schmidt, Peter Lebrecht 448n6
 Schmitt, Arbogast 277n109
 Schmitt, Charles B. 10n14, 22n47, 140n19,
 184n30, 351n343
 Schneider, Friedrich 23n2
 Schneidewin, Friedrich G. 255n37
 Schoedel, William R. 206n212
 Schoell, Richard 185n35
 Schofield, Malcolm 94n22, 252n28, 292n165
 Schott, Jeremy 450n15, 457n50, 464n75,
 464n76
 Schreckenberger, Heinz 217n7, 231n44
 Schreiner, Peter 182n18, 493n1
 Schrenk, Lawrence P. 367n419
 Schrijvers, Pieter Herman 387n477
 Schröder, Werner 486n151
 Schwytzer, Eduard 343n317
 Schwytzer, Hans-Rudolf 337n302
 Sciacca, Giuseppe M. 243n1
 Scott, Dominic 262n57
 Scott, Walter 342n314, 381n457
 Scrivano, Riccardo 136n7
 Sedley, David 278n117, 298n189
 Seel, Gerhard 181n10
 Segonds, Alain Philippe 181n11, 184n28,
 186n37, 426n630
 Selbie, John 263n73
 Ševčenko, Ihor 367n419
 Shapin, Steven 224
 Shapiro, Ian 105n40
 Shelford, April xxxix–xxx, 216–240
 Sherrard, Philip 395n509
 Shestov, Lev 244
 Shorey, Paul 266n74, 273n96, 294n174,
 389n485
 Shukurov, Rustam 71n17
 Sicherl, Martin 179n3
 Sicking, Christiaan M.J. 304n206
 Sider, David 247n12
 Sideridès, Xenophon A. 412n565, 444
 Sidwell, Keith 12n5, 30n28
 Siegfried, Carl 308n217, 388n482
 Sihler, Ernest Gottlieb 329n280
 Sikes, Edward 258n43
 Simbula, Pinuccia 85n73
 Simelidis, Christos 425n629
 Simmons, Michael Bland 320n257
 Simonetta, Marcello 24n3
 Siniosoglou, Niketa 264n68, 426n630,
 426n631, 426n632
 Sinkewicz, Robert E. 396n512
 Sirridge, Mary 577n28
 Sivan, Hagith 460n64
 Skinner, Quentin 87n1, 88n5, 163n90,
 197n2
 Skouteropoulos, Nikos M. 266n75
 Skultety, Steven 105n42
 Smith, Andrew 327n274, 327n277, 426n630
 Smith, Charles Forster 260n51, 261n53,
 261n54
 Smith, Leonardo 27n15
 Smith, Martin Ferguson 374n442
 Smyrlis, Kostis 74n31, 75n34
 Smythe, Dion C. 68n3
 Snell, Bruno 246n10
 Šojat, Zvonimir C. 160n80
 Sorabji, Richard 348n331
 Sottili, Agostino 21n41, 160n81
 Soustal, Peter 75n34
 Spade, Paul V. 200n13, 560n6
 Speer, Andreas 266n72
 Speranzi, David 7n23, 10n36
 Spira, Andreas 410n559
 Spruyt, Joke 557n5
 Stacey, Peter 88n6, 148n48
 Stadter, Phillip A. 27n16, 27n18
 Stahl, William Harris 140n20, 327n277
 Stählin, Otto 387n477, 414n573
 Staikos, Konstantinos 10n35
 Stausberg, Michael 415n575
 Stead, Christopher 293n168
 Stearman, Scott Lee 247n13, 250n25
 Steel, Carlos 181n10, 181n11, 182n16, 186n37,
 191n51, 398n518
 Steinkrüger, Philipp 266n72
 Steinmetz, Peter 284n140
 Stemler, Ágnes 146n44
 Stéphanou, Elipidios 405n540
 Stephens, Susan 276n106
 Stevenson, James 448n6
 Stieber, Joachim 17n24

- Stockdale, W.H. 159n79
 Strecker, Georg 303n205, 310n220, 311n221,
 311n222, 313n229, 314n233, 315n236,
 315n237, 440
 Struever, Nancy 165n98
 Sturlese, Loris 181n10
 Suchla, Beate-Regina 380n453, 511n34,
 514n43, 514n44, 514n45, 514n46, 514n47
 Sykoutris, Ioannis 275n106
 Szalay, Ágnes Ritoókné 135n4
 Szönyi, György Endre 138n12
 Szörényi, László 136n7

 Tambrun-Krasker, Brigitte 415n575, 416n577,
 418n592, 421, 425, 426n632
 Tannery, Paul 405n540
 Tarán, Leonardo 249n16, 276n107
 Taranto, Domenico 144n33
 Tarrant, Harold 286n150, 291n161, 292n167,
 313n229, 348n331
 Tartaglia, Luigi 383n461
 Tavoni, Michael 11n37
 Tellegen-Couperus, Olga 452n26
 Tentori, Paola 124n84
 Terry, Milton S. 463n73
 Thesleff, Holger 245n8
 Thompson, David 13n8, 475n109
 Tietze, Franz 259n47
 Tinnefeld, Franz 81n58, 83n63, 404n537
 Tor, Shaul 274, 433
 Torkki, Juhana 344n320
 Torracca, Luigi 292n163
 Tournoy, Gilbert 25n8, 28, 31n29
 Toussaint, Stéphane 179n3
 Towner, Philip H. 338n305
 Tracy, David xiv
 Trapp, Erich 8n29, 406n541, 407n546,
 407n547, 407n550, 408n551, 444
 Trapp, Michael B. 300n193, 300n194,
 300n195
 Treadgold, Warren T. 232n45
 Tredennick, Hugh 389n484
 Trentman, John A. 560n6
 Treu, Ursula 387n477
 Trinkaus, Charles 560n6
 Trisoglio, Francesco 334n296, 337n301,
 340n310, 362n400
 Trizio, Michele 353n353

 Tsavari, Isabella 364n408
 Turley, Thomas xiv
 Turrini, Guido 281n130, 288n153, 301n198
 Twining, Daniel 277n110
 Twining, Thomas 277n110

 Ullman, Barthold L. 446n36
 Untersteiner, Mario 249n16, 284n139

 Valenti, Maria 10n35
 Valgiglio, Ernesto 295n176
 Vallentyne, Peter 106n44
 van Daele, Hilaire 257n39
 van den Broek, Raymond 284n141, 295n177
 van der Eijk, Philip 387n477
 van der Laan, Adrie 215n55
 van der Nat, Pieter G. 304n206
 van Dieten, Aloysius L. 84n69
 van Dyke, Christina 364n408
 van Heck, Adriano 12n5, 13n7, 19n31, 19n32,
 24n3
 van Kooten, George H. 286n150
 van Ophyijsen, Johannes M. 387n478
 van Ruiten, Jacques 286n150
 van Unnik, Willem C. 304n206, 306n212
 van Winden, Jacobus C.M. 304n206
 Vanderjagt, Arjo 13n5, 30n28, 160n81
 Vanhaelen, Maude 182n15, 182n16, 186n37,
 187n38, 187n39, 188n41, 192n32, 192n54,
 192n55
 Varga, Bernadette 146n44
 Vásárhelyi, Judit P. 146n44
 Vasiliev, Alexandre A. 78n51
 Vasoli, Cesare 135n5, 135n6, 153, 160n80,
 160n81, 214n52
 Vasunia, Phiroze 276n106
 Vegetti, Mario 145n37
 Ventrone, Paola 113n33
 Verbaal, Wim 40n14
 Verbeke, Demmy 202n19
 Verde, Armando 4n8, 110n19, 119n62, 124n82
 Verdenius, Willem Jacob 342n311
 Verdon, Timothy 113n33
 Vermaseren, Maarten J. 295n177
 Vernière, Paul 224n28
 Veyne, Paul 297n180
 Vian, Francis 249n18, 438
 Viansino, Giovanni 285n144, 286n148

- Vicaire, Paul 266n76
 Vickers, Brian 480n30
 Vinel, Françoise 349n335, 394n502
 Viroli, Maurizio 143n32, 148n48
 Viti, Paolo 29n24, 109n14, 109n15, 180n7, 185n33, 478n19
 Vivanti, Corrado 132n122
 Voelke, André-Jean 332n290
 von Arnim, Hans 291n161, 313n229, 418n587
 von Bendemann, Reinhard 297n185
 von Dobschütz, Ernst 465–6
 von Gültlingen, Sybille 547n4
 von Martels, Zweder 13n8, 30n28
 von Prantl, Carl 579n28, 596n68
 von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich 256n37
 Vos, Antonie 143n30, 152n61
 Vossenkühl, Wilhelm 196n1
 Vryonis Jr, Speros 76n38
- wa-Ru'ya, Tajalli 338n305
 Wachinger, Burghart 486n151
 Wachsmuth, Curtius 283n138, 313n229
 Waldman, Louis A. 135n3
 Walker, Daniel P. 220n16
 Wallies, Maximilian 386n476, 390n490
 Walter, Jochen 447n2
 Walther, Ferrit 13n6
 Walther, Rainer 359n383
 Wansbrough, Henry 349n333, 349n339
 Ward, Thomas M. xxin9, xl–xli, 546–604
 Ware, Kallistos Timothy 395n509
 Warren, James 248n15, 298n191
 Watanabe, Morimichi 12n1, 21n41
 Waters, Emily 13n9
 Watson, Foster 206n25, 208n31
 Way, Arthur S. 249n18
 Weber, Max 100
 Wedeck, Harry 327n277
 Wehnert, Jürgen 303n203
 Wehrli, Fritz 370n428
 Weigand, Rudolf 465
 Weiss, Roberto 26n12
 Wendland, Paulus 275, 286n150, 287n151, 287n152, 288n153, 288n154, 289n155, 290n156, 290n157, 291n158, 292n164, 337n300, 337n301, 340n310, 345n322, 374n441, 375n443, 376n445, 377n449, 378n449, 381n455, 436
 Wenger, Antoine 400n525
 Wesseler, Matthias 212n47
 Wesseling, Ari 37n6
 West, Martin 258n43
 Westerink, Leendert Gerrit 183n24, 185n36, 189, 190n48, 348n331, 354n359
 Westman, Robert 222n21
 Westman, Rolf 297n183
 Whealey, Alice 219n12, 226n29, 229n41
 Whitaker, George Herbert 286n150, 287n151, 287n152, 288n153, 288n154, 289n155, 290n157, 291n158, 292n164, 340n310, 345n322, 376n445, 381n455
 White, Carolinne 335n297
 Whiting, Colin M. 317n242
 Whitmarsh, Tim 301n200
 Whittaker, John 95n177, 313n229, 342n312
 Wians, William 279n121
 Wickham, Lionel 333n292, 334n294, 338n304, 344n321
 Wiener, Philip Paul 243n1
 Wiesner, Jürgen 255n35
 Wilken, Robert L. 306n212
 Wilkins, John 257n41, 301n200
 Wilkinson, Kevin 450n12
 Williams, Frederick 333n292, 334n294, 338n304, 344n321
 Williams, Thomas 203n20
 Willis, James 252n28, 327n277, 438
 Wilson, Nigel G. 354n358
 Winter, Bruce W. 291n162
 Witt, Ronald G. xxiin21, xxiin22, 37n7
 Witten, Norbert 45
 Wittner, Lawrence xixn12
 Wlosok, Antoine 244n2, 316n240, 316n241, 317n243, 317n244, 318n245, 318n248, 319n250, 319n252, 446n1, 447, 448n6, 449n11, 450n13, 450n14, 451n22, 455n43, 457n49, 459n59, 470n94
 Wolfson, Harry Austryn 304n207, 305n209
 Wolkan, Rudolf 16n22, 25n6, 25n7, 25n9, 26n12, 26n13, 28n22, 32
 Woodhouse, Christopher Montague 414n572
 Woodward, A.M. 26n10, 27
 Worstbrock, Franz Josef 486n151

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Wright, Charles Henry Hamilton | 393n499 | Zachhuber, Johannes | 341n310 |
| Wright, Wilmer | 305n209 | Zalta, Edward | 94n22, 106n44, 252n29 |
| Wyss, Beatrice | 245n7, 331n289, 371n429 | Zeegers-Vander Vorst, Nicole | 255n37 |
| | | Zeitlin, Solomon | 235n56 |
| Yaneva, Petya | 378n449 | Zeller, Eduard | 248n14, 276n106 |
| Yonezawa, Shigeru | 248n14 | Zeppi, Stelio | 248n15, 250n20, 253n32, 284n140, 431 |
| Young, Douglas | 256n37 | Ziakas, Gregorios | 352n230 |
| Young, Frances | 448n7 | Ziegler, Konrat | 273n96 |
| | | Zintzen, Clemens | 343n316 |
| Zaccaria, Vittorio | 479n124 | Zippel, Gianni | xxvin50, 199n10 |
| Zachariadou, Elizabeth A. | 76n29 | | |

Index of Pre-modern Authors and Persons

- Acilius Severus 460n64
 Adam of Genova 484
 Adrian de But 31
 Aelius Aristides xxxvii, 92n15, 92n16, 95, 96
 Aemilius Portus 183
 Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pius II)
 xxxv, 9, 12–22, 23–32, 94
 Aenesidemus 291, 298, 311, 331, 353, 354,
 358n381, 361
 Aeschylus 279n120
 Agatho (pope) 532, 533n136
 Agostino Nifo 125
 Agricola (son of Avitus) 49
 Alardus of Amsterdam 202n18
 Albertus Magnus OP 159n76, 200n12
 Albrecht von Eyb xl, 485n150, 486–489, 490
 Alcanter de Brahm 31
 Alcinous (Albinus) 192, 343n316
 Alcmaeon of Croton 252–3, 370, 427, 430,
 443
 Aldus Manutius vi, xxxiii, 37, 125, 129n102,
 184
 Alessandro Chimenti 120n65
 Alessandro Machiavelli 119, 120, 121n67
 Alessio Celadeno 7, 8
 Alexander of Aphrodisias xxxiii, 386n476,
 387n477, 418n586
 Alexander of Hales OM 200n12
 Alexander the Great 25, 26, 147, 154, 25
 Alexandre of Villedieu 559n9, 565n14, 566,
 569n18
 Alexios I Komnenos 70, 79
 Alexios III Angelos 80
 Alfonso v the Magnanimous xxv, 27, 28n21
 Amadeus VIII of Savoy 14, 15n15
 Ambrogio Traversari 15, 138, 182, 477
 Ambrose of Milan 458n53, 465, 470n94,
 471n96, 473, 525, 526n88, 532
 Amelius 190
 Ammonius Grammaticus 419n593
 Ammonius Saccas 190, 352, 353n353,
 354n357, 355n365, 390, 405n540
 Anaxagoras 280, 369, 456, 474n105, 506
 Anaximander of Miletus 369
 Anaximenes of Miletus 370
 Andrea of Trebizond 6, 18n13
 Andreas Chrysoberges xxxix, xl, 492–545
 Andreas Pannonius xxxvii–xxxviii, 134–178
 Andronico Callisto 7
 Andronikos I 79
 Angelo Capranica (cardinal) 153n68
 Angelo Decembrio 39, 45
 Angelo Poliziano xxxv, xxxvin106, 9, 36, 37,
 38, 48, 111n23, 113, 115, 117n56, 118, 119,
 122, 124, 125, 126, 131
 Anselm of Havelberg 494n8
 Anthemius 48
 Antoine Arnauld d'Andilly 218, 227n33
 Antonio Beccadelli (Panormita) 8, 16
 Antonio Canigiani 123, 124
 Antonio Corbinelli 186n37
 Antonio da Rho OM xl, 462, 477–486, 490
 Antonio di Lotto da Montespertoli 109
 Antonio Francini da Montevarchi 123
 Antonio Loschi xxvi, 15, 16, 17
 Apuleius 190, 487
 Aratus 344
 Arcesilaus 279, 301, 318, 433, 456, 482
 Archelaus 369
 Archimedes 456n48
 Aristobulus 344
 Aristocles 274, 275, 370–2
 Aristophanes 256–9, 268, 315n235, 361n392,
 401n526, 403, 404, 430
 Aristotle (Philosophus) xxii, xxiv, xxvi,
 xxixn63, xxxi–xxxiv, xxxv, xxxviii,
 xxxix, 12–22, 29, 53, 93, 100, 101, 102, 105,
 163, 181, 195, 199, 200, 202, 209, 256n37,
 275–9, 296, 342n312, 348n331, 357,
 358n376, 362, 366, 384n467, 384n468,
 385n470, 386, 389n484, 390n489,
 391n490, 402n534, 458, 416, 417, 418,
 419, 421, 427, 432, 476, 478, 479, 488,
 550, 554n1, 555, 580n29, 583, 584, 585,
 586, 588, 590n51
 Arius (Hereticus) 368, 515, 544
 Arius Didymus xxxix, 250, 283–5, 295, 301,
 313n229, 329, 341, 342, 347, 370n428,
 406, 407, 408, 434
 Armonios of Athens 184, 244

- Arnobius of Sicca 320–4, 433, 440, 448,
 451n17, 458n56, 466
 Arnold Pannartz 21, 465n149
 Arnold the Carthusian 162n86
 Arsenio Apostolis 10
 Atanasio Calceopulo 3
 Athanasius of Alexandria 368n423
 Athenaeus 256n37
 Athenagoras 310n220
 Augustine of Hippo xxviin55, xl, 103, 152,
 161, 163, 183, 200, 280n126, 281–2, 302,
 363n408, 450, 452, 453, 456, 457, 458,
 461–2, 465, 467, 469, 470, 471, 474, 475,
 476, 477, 478n123, 481, 488, 532n134,
 534n140
 Augustinus Steuchus 183
 Augustus (emperor) 15n17
 Aulus Gellius 38
 Ausonius 130, 131
 Averroes 588n43
 Avienus 50
 Avitus (bishop) 46
 Avitus (emperor) 49

 Baldassare Rassini 487n152
 Bálint Balassi 135
 Banus 234
 Barlaam the Calabrian 362, 364n409,
 365, 367n420, 373, 388n482, 390n489,
 404
 Bartholomew the Englishman OM 163
 Bartolomé de las Casas OP 22n47
 Bartolomeo Facio 14
 Bartolomeo Fonizio 123
 Baruch Spinoza 224n28, 237n62
 Basil (the Great) of Caesarea xxx, 315n236,
 336, 341, 353, 381, 382, 384, 385,
 392n495, 395, 399n523, 401, 410n559,
 410n561, 495, 518, 519, 523, 524, 544
 Basilios Bessarion (cardinal) xxi,
 xxvii–xxviii, xxx–xxxii, xxxii–xxxiv,
 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 138, 180, 181, 182, 183, 192,
 364n409, 492
 Basinio da Parma 9
 Battista di Filippo da Poppi 121, 131
 Battista Malatesta 475, 488
 Battista Mantovano 124
 Battista Sforza 8

 Beatus Rhenanus 213n52
 Benedetto di Piero di Benedetto Riccardini
 (Benedictus Philologus) 38, 116–131, 133
 Benigno Salviati 160
 Berengar of Poitiers 471
 Bernard de Montfaucon OSB xiii
 Bernardo Giunti 130
 Bernardo Machiavelli 111, 121
 Bernardo Michelozzi 117, 118, 119, 123
 Blaise Pascal 244
 Boethius xxxviii, 46, 199, 202, 208, 214,
 265n72, 462n72, 471n97, 480,
 564n10
 Bonaventura OM (cardinal) 142n27, 158,
 200n12, 472, 576n24, 577n28
 Bonfrancesco Arlotti 137
 Bornio da Sala xxxvii, 137, 144–5, 150, 163
 Borso d'Este 137, 145, 146, 154, 158, 159, 161
 Buonaccorso Pepi 122
 Buongiolami 115
 Burgundio of Pisa 495

 Caesar Baronius (cardinal) 231
 Cajetan (cardinal) (Tommaso de Vio OP)
 14n13
 Calcidius 180
 Callistus I (pope) 391n491
 Calpurnius 124
 Candiano Bollani 137
 Carlo di Silvestro detto Riccio 127
 Carlo Marsuppini 19
 Carneades 456
 Cassiodorus 465, 476, 489
 Catullus 122
 Celestine I (pope) 515
 Celio Calcagnini 489n156
 Cesare Borgia 548
 Charles VIII 548
 Chilperic I, King of Neustria 51
 Chilperic I, King of the Burgundians 51
 Christophe Sandius 219n14, 225n28, 236–8
 Chrysippus 313n229, 366, 418n587
 Cicero xxvi, 16, 19, 20, 30, 39, 40, 46, 58, 59,
 60, 61, 62, 95n24, 105n42, 111, 140, 148,
 155, 157, 158, 161, 162, 163, 169, 172, 176,
 202, 211n44, 212n47, 214, 279–81,
 285n146, 286n148, 313n229, 319, 320,
 324, 327n271, 327, 328, 329, 370n426,

- 370n429, 396n513, 432, 438, 439, 440,
 454, 456, 458, 459, 467, 473, 475, 476,
 478, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 487, 488,
 489, 490, 550, 565, 566
 Cimber 29
 Clement of Alexandria 369, 376, 377n449,
 378n451, 382, 383n461, 387n477, 414,
 415n573, 415n575, 466
 Clotilda 51
 Clovis 51, 94
 Coluccio Salutati 19n31, 475
 Commodian 466
 Conrad Gesner 185n34
 Consentius 457, 458n55
 Constantine I xl, 94, 448n6, 449n12, 452,
 456, 457, 464, 489
 Constantine IX Monomachos 69, 70
 Constantino Lascaris 5
 Constantius 44
 Cosimo de' Medici 108, 187, 188
 Crispus 456–7
 Cyprian of Carthage 450, 465, 466, 471n96
 Cyril of Alexandria 342n352, 381, 466n85,
 495, 530n120
 Damascius 191
 Damasus I (pope) 459–60, 461n66, 465, 515
 Dante 46
 David (commentator) 352, 354n357, 355,
 405n540
 David Blondel 232, 234
 Decius 451
 Demetrianus 460
 Demetrios Cydones 266n72, 398–404, 406,
 408, 411, 412n566, 445
 Demetrios Raoul Kavakes 418n587
 Demetrius 276n108
 Democritus 280, 285n146, 319n252, 370, 456,
 473, 476, 488
 Demosthenes 125
 Denis Diderot 244n3
 Denys the Carthusian 138, 150, 151
 Desiderius Erasmus xxiv, xxxiv, 53–63,
 88n7, 228, 244, 551
 Diagoras of Melos 374n442
 Didymus Caecus 380n454
 Dimitrius Gelayti 8
 Diocletian 449, 452, 464
 Diogenes Laertius 94, 253n30, 291, 300–1,
 315n235, 358n381, 370n428, 438
 Diogenes of Oenoanda 374n442
 Diogenes of Sinope 94
 Diomedes the Grammarian 122, 126, 550,
 573, 574
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus xxvi
 Dionysus 25
 Dioscorus of Alexandria 513, 515, 544
 Domenico Benivieni 126, 127, 133
 Domenico Capranica (cardinal) 17
 Domizio Calderini 8, 9, 10n34
 Donatus 126, 564n14
 Edward Bernard 216–7
 Elias (commentator) 352, 355n365
 Empedocles 259n45, 270, 280, 300, 370, 456
 Epicurus 283, 303, 304, 305n209, 360n388,
 368, 369n425, 374n442, 482
 Epiphanius of Salamis 250, 253, 273, 274,
 275, 371, 378, 442
 Erard III Le Maure 78
 Ercole d'Este 137, 154, 161
 Etienne Le Moyne 216
 Eugenius IV (pope) 13, 14, 15, 16, 18n28,
 21n39, 107, 477, 484, 493
 Eunomius of Cyzicus 331, 344, 368
 Euripides 251n26, 255n37
 Eusebius of Caesarea xxvii, 231, 235, 236,
 239, 274, 275, 370–2, 382, 415n573,
 415n575, 457n50, 463, 465
 Eustratius of Nicaea 386n476
 Euthymius Zygabenus 408
 Eutyches (archimandrite) 513
 Euzoius 341n310
 Federico da Montefeltro 8
 Felix V (Amadeus VIII) 12, 15, 16
 Fernando of Cordova xxxiii
 Ferrante of Naples (king) 182
 Filippo de' Medici 108
 Filippo de' Nerli 122, 131
 Filippo Giunti 118n59, 119, 122, 123, 124, 126,
 127, 129n102
 Filippo Maria Visconti 477
 Firmianus Lactantius xxxix, xl, 19, 243n2,
 302n202, 306, 316–322, 327n275, 329,
 348, 438, 440, 441, 446–491

- Flavio Biondo 13, 39
 Flavius Arrianus xxxv, 26–9, 32
 Florentinus 105n42
 Francesco d'Antonio Dini 128
 Francesco da Carrara 148, 150
 Francesco de Fusce (cardinal) 16
 Francesco Filelfo 6, 8, 31, 40, 484
 Francesco Marescalchi 153
 Francesco Patrizi 105n42, 180, 183, 186
 Francesco Petrarca xxivin47, xxxvii–xxxviii, 46, 124, 145–78 *passim*, 213, 475, 487
 Francesco Vettori 110, 112, 113, 133
 Francesco Visconti 479n125
 Francis of Assisi OM 94
 Franciscus de Nigrinis (Francesco Pescennio Greco) 8
 Frederick III 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21

 Gaetano da Thiene xxxiin83
 Galen 30in200, 329, 387n477, 390, 436
 Gallienus 451
 Gaspare Zacchi 7
 Gasparino da Barzizza xxvi
 Geert Groote 145–6
 Gelasius I (pope) 465
 Geoffroy of Villehardouin 69n10
 Georg Graevius 222n20
 George Amiroutzes 492
 George Cedrenos 382n461, 394n506
 George Gemistos (Plethon) xxixn68, xxx, xxxiiin90, xl, 364n409, 412–27, 444, 492
 George Hermonimous xxin30
 George of Trebizond vi, xvi–xxxvii *passim*, 5, 6, 20, 31, 53–63, 87–106, 181, 492
 George Pachymeres 380n453, 405n540
 George Scholarios (Gennadios II) xl, 412–3, 444
 George the Presbyter 493, 497, 498, 516n50, 521, 528n11, 541n161, 543n165
 George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel 244n3
 Georgius Bonagraoutis 8
 Georgius de Nigrinis 8
 Gerardo Landriani (cardinal) 19
 Geronimo Ranuzzi 153n68
 Giacomo Badoer 82
 Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola 458n56, 489n156
 Giannantonio de' Pandoni (Porcelio) 5, 7, 9

 Gilbert of Tournai OM xl, 471–5, 481, 483, 490
 Giles of Rome OESA xxxvii, 143, 144, 150, 151, 163, 200n12
 Giles of Viterbo OESA (cardinal) xxviii, 183
 Gilles Ménage 228n39
 Giorgio Coressio xxix
 Giorgio Dati 122
 Giovambattista Nasi 124
 Giovanni Argiropulo 4, 8
 Giovanni Aurispa 15, 16, 26, 146
 Giovanni Battista di maestro Matteo detto Manco 130
 Giovanni Berardi (cardinal) 17n23
 Giovanni Boccaccio 41, 124, 475
 Giovanni Campisio 17, 18, 19, 21
 Giovanni de' Medici (Leo X) 10, 117n56
 Giovanni di Messer Guidantonio Vespucci 119
 Giovanni Domenico d'Antonio di Francesco Dell'Azzuro 110
 Giovanni Gatti OP xxxii
 Giovanni Lamola 487n152
 Giovanni Lorenzi 9, 10n34
 Giovanni Pico della Mirandola 180, 183, 186n38, 192, 193, 195, 489n156
 Giovanni Pontano 45, 48
 Giovanni Rhosos 7, 186n37
 Giovanni Serra 200
 Girolamo Savonarola OP 109, 114, 126
 Girolamo di Zanobi 114
 Giuliano Cesarini 15, 18
 Giuliano di Bartolomeo Tendi da Scarperia 109
 Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz 209, 211, 224n28
 Gratian 461n67, 476
 Gregory Acindynos 367, 373, 379n452, 401n528, 403n536, 404
 Gregory of Nazianzus xxxix, 289n155, 304n205, 304n207, 314n233, 314n234, 331–348, 351, 354, 359n382, 361, 365, 366, 374n442, 380, 381, 382, 393, 395, 409, 411, 425, 426, 427, 440, 495, 508n26, 509n28, 511n35, 512n37, 515
 Gregory of Nyssa 304n207, 341n310, 349n335, 360–1, 373, 380n454, 388n479, 395, 408, 410
 Gregory Palamas xl, 255n36, 362, 363–98, 401, 404, 408n552, 444, 512n38

- Gregory Thaumaturgus 305n209
 Gregory I the Great (pope) 476
 Guarino Guarini da Verona xxvi, 15, 16, 40
 Guglielmo Giralaldi 137
 Guillaume Balsarin 546
- Haci Bayram Velî 404–8
 Hannibal 21n40, 147, 154, 175
 Hector Boece 32
 Henry of Ghent 179
 Henry VI (King of England) 13
 Hephæstion 126
 Heracles 26
 Heraclitus 263n64, 270, 370
 Hermagoras 329
 Hermias 191
 Hermogenes of Tarsus xxvi, 53, 60, 129n102, 326n272, 329
 Hesiod 9, 258n43, 276
 Hilary of Poitiers 465, 471n96
 Hippocrates 90
 Hippodamus 29
 Hippolytus 370, 371n429, 372n432, 438
 Homer 9, 175, 185n34, 246n10, 247n11, 249n18, 258n43, 276, 299, 314n230, 343n317, 359n384
 Horace 45n35, 122, 482
 Hormisdas (pope) 465
 Hugo Grotius 224, 227
 Hugo Ripelin 159n76
 Humbert of Silva Candida (cardinal) 494n8
 Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester 13
- Iamblichus 180, 184, 190
 Innocent VII (pope) 5
 Irenaeus of Lyon 284, 306
 Isaac II Angelos 80
 Isaac Sebastocrator 180
 Isidore of Seville xl, 39, 50, 458n53, 467–9, 472, 474, 481, 483, 489, 490
 Isocrates xxxvii, 271–3, 432
 István Várdai (cardinal) 137, 148
- Jacopo Ammanati (cardinal) 154n68
 Jacopo da Carrara 148
 Jacopo di Bartolomeo da Garfagnana 124
 Jacopo di Franceschetto Corso 129
 Jacobus Seba de Cipro 8
- Jacques Auguste de Thou 548
 Jacques Cujas 548
 Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples 213, 550
 János Hunyadi 147–8
 János Vitéz (cardinal) 137, 148, 154n68
 Janus Lascaris 10, 184
 Janus Pannonius 135, 137, 150
 Jean Buridan 596n68
 Jean Gerson 21n43, 476
 Jean Le Clerc 227n34
 Jean Mabillon OSB 220n17
 Jean Trechsel 548
 Jerome xl, 163, 231, 234, 230, 236, 457, 458, 459–61, 465, 470, 471n96, 475, 476, 477, 478n123, 488, 490
 Johann Jakob Brucker 243
 Johann Sensenschmidt 486
 Johann Tuschek 17
 Johannes Chabriolis 233
 Johannes Hinderbach 25, 27, 28
 Johannes Tolner 18–19
 John Argyropoulos xxix, xxxi
 John Cassian 466
 John Chrysostom 381, 392n195, 399n522, 400n525, 401, 402n533, 403, 404, 410n559, 495, 524, 526n90
 John Cyparissiotēs 404
 John Donne 195
 John Duns Scotus OM 143, 152, 153, 158, 200n12, 202, 203n20, 209, 214, 365, 581n33, 582n30
 John Gunthorp 31n30
 John Laskaris Kalopheros 78
 John Locke 97n27, 105
 John Mair 14n13
 John Mandeville 534n140
 John of Damascus 287n152, 352, 353, 397n515, 408, 495, 511, 515
 John Philoponus 352, 354n357, 355n365, 359, 386n476, 388n480, 390
 John Scotus Eriugena 138
 John Stobaeus 283, 284n142, 313n229
 John Tiptoft 13
 John V Palaiologos 81
 John VIII Palaiologos 493
 John Wilkins 31
 Joachim of San Giovanni a Piro 3, 11
 Joseph II, Patriarch of Constantinople 543

- Joseph Glanvill 245n7
 Joseph Justus Scaliger 217, 227, 548
 Josephus xxxix, 216–40, 304n206
 Josse Bade 548
 Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda 22
 Juan Luis Vives xxxvi, 199, 205–9, 213–5
 Julian the Apostate 304n205, 305n209
 Julius Caesar 487
 Julius Nepos 51
 Julius II (pope) 14n13, 128
 Justin Martyr 231, 235, 304n207, 313n229, 343n316
 Juvenal 44, 313n229
- Kalomodios 84
 Kaspar Schlick 18
 Konrad Schweinheim 21, 465n149
- Lactantius Placidus 475n106
 Leo I the Great (pope) 471n96, 500, 501, 515, 532
 Leo IX (pope) 533n136
 Leo X (pope) xxxv, 10, 117n56
 Leon Battista Alberti 153
 Leonardo Bruni 12–22, 28, 29, 37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 475, 476, 487, 488
 Leucippus 369
 Lilio Gregorio Giraldi 41
 Lipsius 88n7
 Livius Andronicus 39, 46
 Livy 482
 Lorenzo de' Medici 43, 113, 114, 115, 117n56, 186n37
 Lorenzo di Piero de' Medici 116
 Lorenzo Romuleo 129, 130n103
 Lorenzo Valla xxvi, xxvii, xxviii, 11, 27n20, 39, 153, 199–201, 205, 213–215, 480–1, 550, 563, 564, 576n23
 Louis IX 472
 Lovato dei Lovati 46
 Luca de Neapoli, presbiter 8n26
 Lucas Holstenius 183, 185
 Lucas Osiander 227
 Luchino dal Verme 147, 150, 151, 154
 Lucian 190, 251n26, 258n43, 313n229, 421, 422
 Lucretius 42, 111n25, 319n249, 473
 Lucrezia Tornabuoni 115
- Maarten Dorp 202n19
 Macedonius of Constantinople 368, 515, 544
 Macrobius 117n58, 118n59, 140, 155, 158, 324, 327, 328n277, 396, 438
 Maioranus 48
 Mani 466
 Manuel II Palaiologos 404–411, 444
 Marcantonio Sabellico 129
 Marcellus Victorius 46n35
 Marco Barbo (cardinal) 9
 Marco Musuro 10
 Marco Portonario 155, 159n79
 Mariano de Magistris 9n31
 Marie-Madeleine, Madame de Lafayette 222
 Marie, Madame de Sevigné 217
 Marinus of Neapolis 426n630
 Marinus presbyter 538
 Mario Nizolio xxxvi, 199, 205, 209–214
 Marius Victorinus 324–331, 440, 465
 Mark Eugenikos xl, 380n452, 492–545
 Marsilio Ficino xxvii–xxviii, xxxii, xxxviii, 8, 117n56, 137, 153, 179–95, 550
 Martin V (pope) 5
 Martino Filetico 9
 Martinus Uranius (Prenninger) 183n20, 185
 Marullus 45, 48
 Matteo da Rocca San Casciano 121, 131
 Matthias Hunyadi 134n1, 135, 137, 142, 145n41, 147–8, 152, 154
 Maximilla 466
 Maximos Magistros 359n383
 Maximos Planoudes 364n408, 396n513
 Maximus of Tyre 299–300, 340n308, 418n591
 Maximus the Confessor 495, 516n51, 518, 519, 523, 529, 538, 542, 544
 Mehmed II 93, 94n20
 Melissus of Samos 188
 Menasseh Ben Israel 221
 Metrodorus of Chios 250n22, 273–5, 369, 370–2, 376, 382, 427, 432
 Michael Choniates 71, 76n40
 Michael Psellus 184, 354–55, 359, 405n540
 Michael VII Doukas 70
 Michael VIII 82
 Michel de Montaigne 244, 297

- Michele Savonarola 150
 Michele Verino 110, 133
 Miklós Nyujtói 142, 150n51
 Minucius Felix 306n214, 450
 Montanus 466
 Montius 50
 Muhammad bin Tughdj Al-Ikhshid 78

 Naldo Naldi 8
 Neilos, Patriarch of Constantonople 383n463
 Nemesianus 124
 Nestorius 515, 544
 Niccolò Alberghi (cardinal) 23
 Niccolò Angeli da Bucine 124
 Niccolò Della Valle 9
 Niccolò Leonicensio 8
 Niccolò Machiavelli xxxvii, 36, 43, 105, 110, 111, 112, 113, 119, 120, 121, 130, 131, 132, 133
 Niccolò Perotti xxxii, 8, 119
 Niccolò Sagundino 6
 Niccolò Sofiano 6
 Nicephoros Choumnos 355–8
 Nicephoros Gregoras xxxix, 293, 358–61, 362, 364n409, 391, 395, 404, 422, 442
 Nicholas Cabasilas 362–3, 364n409
 Nicholas Cusanus (cardinal) xxx, 6, 181, 182, 192
 Nicholas v (pope) (Tommaso Parentucelli) 6, 17n23, 27
 Nicolaus of Methone 179, 366n417
 Nicoletto Vernia 125
 Nicolò Arcimboldi 478, 479n124, 481, 484
 Numa Pompilius 41
 Numenius 328n277

 Ocellus Lucanus 183n22
 Olympiodorus the Elder 185, 191
 Olympiodorus the Deacon 348–50, 394, 442
 Optatus 465
 Origen 221, 228, 230, 231, 235, 236, 305n209, 343n316
 Orion 255n37
 Orosius 476, 487
 Ovid 41n17, 131

 Paolo di Antonio Sassi da Ronciglione 36, 110, 111, 111n25, 112, 113, 121, 131, 132, 133
 Paolo di Giovanni Comparini da Prato 113, 114, 128n99, 133
 Paolo Giovio 132
 Parmenides 188, 189, 193, 194, 280, 370n429
 Paul II (pope) 6n15
 Paul of Tarsus 24, 25, 342n312, 343, 344n318, 345, 378n449, 388n482, 408, 476, 495, 499, 500, 506, 534, 536
 Paul of Venice xxxiin83, 200n12, 549
 Pelagius 457, 458n55, 462
 Persius 482
 Peter Abelard 144, 470
 Peter Lombard xxixn23, 109, 158n73
 Peter of Spain 199, 549, 552, 557n5, 565n12, 567n15
 Petrus Balbus Pisanus 182, 183
 Petrus Crinitus (Pietro del Riccio Baldi) xxxiii–xxxvi, 36–52, 110, 111, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 132
 Petrus de Alvernia 559, 560
 Petrus de Aquila OM (Scotellus) 153, 157–8, 160, 163
 Petrus Helias 577n28
 Petrus Ramus xxvin47
 Petrus Victorius 276n106
 Phileas of Carthage 29
 Philip of Macedon 132
 Philipp Melanchthon 213
 Philippe du Plessis-Mornay 227
 Philo of Alexandria xxxix, 95n24, 275n103, 285–93, 294, 301, 305, 308, 331, 337n300, 337n301, 340, 341, 345, 350n340, 354, 358, 359n384, 360, 361n393, 362n400, 373–8, 381, 382, 386n477, 388, 391n493, 394n503, 396n512, 436
 Philodemus of Gadara 374n442
 Philostratus III 53
 Philotheos Kokkinos 378n449, 398n519, 401–2
 Photius of Constantinople 231–2, 353–5, 377n448
 Pier Candido Decembrio 138, 478, 479, 484, 490
 Pier Maria Calandri 121, 131
 Pier Paolo Vergerio xxxv, 26–8, 32–35, 400n525
 Piero da Noceto 17
 Piero Soderini 116

- Pierre Bayle 220, 249n15
 Pierre d'Ailly (cardinal) 560, 575n26, 576n24, 559, 560, 575n26, 576n24
 Pierre Nicole 223–4
 Pierre Poussines 231n44
 Pierre-Daniel Huet xxxix, 216–240
 Pietro Bembo (cardinal) 10
 Pietro Delfino OSB Cam. 115
 Pietro di Domenico Domizi 113, 114, 115, 116, 133
 Pietro Vitali 3
 Piramo d'Antonio da Bruscoli 109, 110n16
 Pius II (pope), cf. Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini xxxv, 9, 12–22, 24, 32, 94, 108
 Plato vi, xxii, xxiv, xxviii, xxx, xxxi–xxxiv, xxxvii, xxxviii, xxxix, 8, 14, 15, 20, 60, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 106, 137, 163, 180–193, 202–3, 209, 256n37, 259n46, 262–71, 278, 275n103, 284, 286, 292n165, 294, 296, 301, 311, 314n232, 327, 330, 335, 337, 342n312, 342n313, 343, 344, 345, 348, 354, 356n371, 357, 360n388, 361n393, 369n425, 373n440, 377n449, 378n449, 384, 386n475, 389n485, 395n510, 399, 400n525, 401, 405, 407n548, 410, 413, 415n575, 416, 418, 420n598, 423, 424, 427, 428, 430, 435, 438, 442, 457, 463, 476, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 488, 494n7, 590, 595
 Pietro Pomponazzi 125
 Plautus 39, 113, 487
 Plethon xxixn68, xxx, xxxi, xxxii, 364n409, 412–27, 444, 492
 Pliny the Younger 227n34, 228
 Plotinus 183, 189, 190, 330n285, 337n302, 378n449
 Plutarch of Athens 189, 191
 Plutarch of Chaeronea 7, 95n24, 190, 191, 293–8, 341n310, 360n391, 373, 375n443, 407, 418n587, 427, 436
 Poggio Bracciolini 15, 16, 19, 29, 31, 39, 480n127
 Pomponio Gaurico 124
 Porphyry of Tyre 141n24, 180, 190, 199, 320, 324, 326–328, 360n388, 438, 441, 450n15, 454n34, 458, 463, 464
 Posidippus of Pella 130
 Prisca 466
 Priscian 126, 564, 577n28
 Priscianus Lydus 405n540
 Probus (Petronius Probianus) 460
 Proclus xxxviii, 179–95, 246n9, 270, 378n449, 387n477, 389n518, 415n575, 442
 Protagoras xxxix, 253–5, 258, 259, 263, 274, 275, 302n200, 303n204, 305n209, 372, 374n441, 374n442, 382, 427, 430
 Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias 386n476, 387n477, 418n586
 Pseudo-Athanasius of Alexandria 368n423, 368n424, 391
 Pseudo-Augustine 138
 Pseudo-Basil of Caesarea 380n454, 387n477
 Pseudo-Cicero 326n271
 Pseudo-Clement of Rome 303–6, 309–315, 336, 341n324, 388, 440
 Pseudo-Demetrius 53
 Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite xxviii67, xxxviii, 138, 163, 180, 183, 194, 195, 330, 381, 495, 511n34, 514n43
 Pseudo-Galen 387n477, 438
 Pseudo-Hermes Trismegistus 342n314
 Pseudo-Hippocrates 259–60, 262, 301, 302n200, 427, 430
 Pseudo-Homer 258n43
 Pseudo-John Chrysostom 392n495
 Pseudo-Justin 339n306, 345, 347, 348n330, 442, 508n24
 Pseudo-Lysias 315n235
 Pseudo-Maximus Confessor 380n453, 381
 Pseudo-Methodius xvii
 Pseudo-Plato 267n77, 386n475
 Pseudo-Thomas Aquinas 456n97
 Ptolemy 478
 Pyrrho 303, 305n209, 362, 366
 Pythagoras of Samos 188, 190, 455, 457, 513n41
 Quintilian xxv, xxvi, xxxvi, xxxviii, 16, 29–30, 45n35, 46, 50, 59, 214, 329
 Quintus Smyrnaeus 249, 438
 Raffaele Maffei 9, 10n34
 Ralph Strode 200n12
 Raymond of Sebond 244

- Raynauld Jean de Fleury 548, 555, 556
 Recared, king of the Visigoths 94
 René Descartes xxxix, 220, 222–3, 239
 René Rapin 222
 Richard FitzRalph 494n8
 Richard Simon 219n13, 229
 Rinieri Guicciardini 117n56
 Robert Arnauld d'Andilly 218, 223–4, 227n33
 Robert Gaguin 53
 Robert Kilwardby OP 142n27, 577n28
 Roger Bacon OM 142n27, 571n20
 Roger II of Sicily 72n23
 Romanos I Lekapenos 78
 Romulus (founder of Rome) 91–92
 Romulus Augustulus 51
 Rudolf Agricola xxvii, xxxviii, 160, 199,
 201–209, 213–5
 Rufinus 126, 303n205

 Sallust 123, 155, 156, 163, 550, 565, 566
 Samuel Bochart 220n16
 Santio Ballo 477
 Saracenus 138
 Scipio Africanus 147, 149, 154, 155, 156, 166,
 168, 169, 170, 177, 178, 480
 Scipione Forteguerrì (Carteromaco) 38, 124,
 125
 Scutellius 182n16, 183, 185n34
 Sedulius Scottus 470n94, 473, 474
 Seneca xxxix, 46, 126, 127, 163, 284–6, 301,
 318n246, 319, 329, 342, 434, 439, 441,
 475, 476, 478, 488
 Severus of Antioch 448n74
 Sextus Empiricus 245, 246, 251, 286n150,
 289n155, 291, 292, 298–301, 303n205,
 311–315, 331, 332–3, 336, 337, 339, 340,
 351, 352, 353n355, 356–8, 361, 363,
 364n408, 364n409, 365, 366n417,
 370n428, 371, 382, 384, 385, 389, 390,
 394, 396n512, 398, 399, 406, 418, 420,
 421, 422, 423, 424, 427, 429, 436
 Sextus Julius Africanus 466n84
 Sextus Propertius 122
 Sicco Polenton 46–7
 Sidonius Apollinaris 39, 40, 46–7, 48, 49–52
 Sigismund (Emperor) 27
 Sigismund of Tyrol 15, 21
 Simone d'Agnolo da Fucecchio 114, 115

 Simplicius 405n540
 Sixtus IV (pope) 154n68
 Socrates 188, 189, 190, 192, 202–3, 257–9, 262,
 263, 264–5, 267, 268, 270, 284, 315n235,
 318, 342n313, 368, 369n425, 377n449,
 380n452, 401, 403, 404, 407n548, 425,
 427n631, 432, 433, 456, 457, 480, 482
 Sophocles 279n120
 Sossianus Hierocles 451n20, 454n34
 Sotion of Alexandria 301, 370n248
 Statius 44, 131, 475n106
 Stephen of Hungary 94
 Suetonius 38, 40, 119, 227n34, 230, 237
 Sulpicius Appollinaris 126
 Sulpicius Severus 466n84
 Sylvester I (pope) 515
 Symoninus Gilinus 479n125
 Symphorien Champier xxxix, 546–553, 554,
 559n–600n
 Synesius of Cyrene 372–3, 376–8, 381
 Syrianus 189, 191, 192

 Tacitus 218, 227n34, 228, 230, 237
 Tanneguy Le Fèvre 233–236, 238–9
 Terence 111, 118n60, 125, 126, 487, 548
 Terentianus Maurus 126, 548n6
 Tertullian 231, 235, 306, 318n246, 321n258,
 450, 466
 Themistius 386n476
 Theodora (Theophilos) 78
 Theodore Gaza xxiin30, xxv, xxixn67,
 xxxiii, xxxivn99, 4, 6, 7, 184, 492
 Theodore II Ducas Lascaris 395
 Theodore Metochites 358, 362n400,
 364n408, 395
 Theodoret of Cyrus xxxix, 246n9, 345–8,
 442
 Theodoretus 230
 Theodoric II 47n38, 49
 Theodorus of Asine 190
 Theodosius 44
 Theognis 256n37
 Theophilos (emperor) 78
 Theophilus of Antioch 255n37, 303n204,
 306–8, 311, 438, 451n85, 466n85
 Theophrastus xxxii, 476, 488
 Thomas Aquinas OP xxiii, xl, 93, 141, 152,
 163, 179, 199, 362, 412, 445, 471, 476

- Thomas of Erfurt 553n1, 558n3, 570n16
 Thucydides xxxv, 23–32, 260–1, 279n120, 415n575, 430
 Tibullus 45n35, 122
 Timon of Philus 301n199
 Tomaso Luiti 150
 Tommaso di Stefano 110
 Tommaso Soderini 124n81
 Trajan 228
 Tyconius 466

 Ugolino Verino 36, 110, 111n22

 Valerian 451
 Valerius Flaccus 122, 123
 Valerius Maximus 487
 Varro xxxix, 255n35, 281–3, 296n178, 301, 302, 317, 318, 342, 427, 434, 439, 441, 469, 476, 488
 Venantius Fortunatus 52, 475n106
 Vespasian 217, 231, 235, 237
 Vespasiano Bisticci 13
 Victorinus of Pettau 466, 487
 Virgil 10, 29, 30, 39, 42, 124, 464n79, 473, 475

 Wessel Gansfort 213
 Wibald of Corvey OSB 471n96
 Wilhemus de Lapide 15
 William II of Villehardouin 82
 William of Auvergne 141n27
 William of Auxerre 42n27
 William of Moerbeke OP 13, 15, 22, 179, 180, 181, 182, 186n37
 William of Ockham OM xxxviii, 196–7, 198, 200–1, 202, 212, 213–4, 548, 549, 550, 551, 576n24, 579n29, 580n29, 582n30, 583–602 *passim*
 William Popple 216
 William Wheatley 471n97

 Xanthus Ballus Panormitanus 471n117
 Xenophanes xxxix, 243–445
 Xenophon 265n71, 380n452

 Zaccaria Calliergi 10
 Zeno 188, 189, 482
 Zeno (emperor) 47n38
 Zepherinus (pope) 532, 533n136
 Zoroaster 415–6, 418n587